E RISE OF M

C. R. CONDER

THE RISE OF MAN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/riseofman00condiala

Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

THE RISE OF MAN

BY COL. C. R. CONDER
LL.D., M.R.A.S.

That God which ever lives and loves:
One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves.
In Memoriam.

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
1908

PRINTED BY
HAZELL, WATSON AND VINEY, LD.,
LONDON AND AYLESBURY.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA

CB
67
C6

PREFACE

The subject of this volume is the Social History of mankind, studied by aid of the results of science and research which have accumulated so rapidly during the lifetime of the present generation. The customs and beliefs of men form the basis of such inquiry; and the ideas of natural growth, and of guidance, lead us to look forward to the "far-off divine event," by showing us the purpose which we can discern in the past, if we study the rise of man from the beginning of history in Asia.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

PAGE

I. PURPOSE 1

II. SCIENCE 8

CHAPTER II

EARLY MAN

I. NATURAL 26

II. PREHISTORIC REMAINS 29

III. LANGUAGE 38

IV. RACE 49

CHAPTER III

CIVILISATION

I. ANCIENT 81

II. MEDIÆVAL 118

III. MODERN 143

CHAPTER IV

HISTORIC RELIGIONS

PAGE

I. ANIMISM 150
II. EGYPT 161
III. THE AKKADIANS 170
IV. BABYLONIA 180
V. THE WEST ARYANS 187
VI. PERSIA 197
VII. INDIA 209
VIII. CHINA AND JAPAN 220
IX. AMERICA 226
X. ISLAM 233

CHAPTER V

THE HEBREWS

I. HISTORY 251
II. THE BIBLE 264
III. LATER BOOKS 287

CHAPTER VI

HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

I. ORIGINAL 293
II. PRIMITIVE 303
III. MEDIÆVAL 336
IV. MODERN 342

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS 353

INDEX 359

THE RISE OF MAN

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

i. Purpose.—To Lucretius, and to his master, Epikouros, the universe seemed as sand blown by the wind and falling into new heaps mechanically. If this were true there would be no meaning in the study of human history. We should say with the Preacher, "There is no new thing under the sun," failing to recognise the purpose which, through countless ages, has directed the growth of higher things from lower forms. But the increase of true knowledge enables us now to scan spaces of time of which the ancients had no conception, and to trace the purpose running through the ages which they so often denied. Human history in its widest sense, studied on the basis of such principles, becomes one of the most fascinating of studies; and the key to history is found in knowledge of the social customs of men, and of the beliefs as to the future on which those customs were founded.

We enter with the twentieth century on a new period of intense activity—an age when old ideas are losing their influence, and when men are striving to digest the new knowledge which has increased so rapidly in the last two centuries. To the timid it

seems that general scepticism will be the final outcome, but a study of the past should reassure us as to the future.

Take, for instance, two periods of European history when the conditions were not unlike those of our own time—the second and the sixteenth centuries of the Christian Era. In each case the western nations had gradually been educated by a wider intercourse with the rest of the known world, and were shaking themselves free from the prejudices of their old narrow barbarism. Towards the close of the second century all the conflicting forces which still struggle in our midst were in play. Scepticism and philosophy, mysticism and hypnotism, superstition and popular belief, seemed about to lead men to general indifference and despair. Yet the actual outcome was the rapid spread and final victory of the Christian faith. So again in the sixteenth century a new Europe had been created by the spread of Asiatic education among the wild Teutons and Norsemen, and the same features of conflicting tendencies appeared on a larger and higher scale. New knowledge spread north and west from Italy, and while some predicted a return to the ancient paganism, and others a final triumph of unbelief, the actual outcome was the birth of a purer Protestant faith.

So too now, when the increase of science, and of intercourse with far lands, has broken down the narrow walls of ancient prejudice, we may expect that the outcome of the same forces will be the triumph of a yet purer and higher faith. No one can read the current literature of the day without perceiving that among all classes, from the learned of our universities to the popular novelist, men are busy in the attempt to separate reality from error, to preserve vital truths while discarding ancient superstitions, and to attain some form of belief that shall satisfy both the head

and the heart. Those whose trust in purpose is founded on knowledge of history—the history of earth and the history of man—will not share the fears which this great conflict creates. They will not regard the steady advance of man as being due to accident, and they will still see before them hope—that is something to "grasp"—in the future.

One of the most notable features of human history, indeed, has been the steady growth of hope, and the gradual loss of fear. Man became stronger as he learned more of the world and of the great natural forces which first terrified his imagination. He conquered the intense sadness and despair with which he once looked on death, and on the unknown future; and he has discovered that the ancient enthralling superstitions are vain fears due to want of trust in the eternal purpose. Living in countries where all can read and write, we can hardly appreciate the paralysing effect of such superstitions, or the timidity of mankind when ignorant of the realities which he strives to explain. Those who have lived long among the peasantry of half-civilised countries will know how much happier and less anxious we now are—in spite of all the great evils in our midst—than are the ignorant, or the savage, or than were the ancients according to their own recorded words. The Moslem peasant is not a savage. He has long been under the influence of a most ancient civilisation, but he has been unable, through ignorance, to free himself from the terrors which were once felt by all. He lives in an atmosphere of miracle, in constant dread of evil spirits, and ghosts of the wicked dead. If his horse kneels down it is because it sees a spirit. If he falls ill it is because the local Neby has smitten him in anger. Every unexpected event is an omen of evil. His only reliance is placed on charms and lucky emblems, which he carries hidden under his shirt.

I have seen the whole village of Gibeon convulsed with terror, by the smoke of a magnesium torch in the cave of its spring—for was it not evident that the Neby had come down in cloud and in wrath? The prophet, or the holy man who works miracles, wanders from village to village, preceded by drum and pipe, as of old, working himself into ecstasy, healing or smiting, predicting the future, repelling evil demons. Men pass their lives in continual fear of misfortune, of ghosts, sickness, wild beasts, darkness, thunder, witches, the evil eye, the ghoul, and the secret curse of the wronged.

What is true of Asia is equally true of the ignorant in Europe. The Italian peasant who believes in the Madonna and in his patron saint, believes yet more in the "stregha" or witch, in the "monicelli" or hooded gnomes of the valleys, in the "folletti" or fairies, who still in Tuscany retain the names and the characters of the old Etruscan gods. The belief in ghosts and fairies still prevails also in Ireland, where men naturally brave are afraid to go out in the dark. We are inclined to think of ancient superstition in its romantic aspect, as something beautiful and poetic; but life among such peasantry, like the study of ancient records, will convince us how ugly, savage, and hateful the beliefs of the past really were. Terrible crimes have been due, in Ireland and elsewhere, in quite recent times, to such superstitions. The nymphs in Roman belief were evil beings who stole children, and not merely beautiful guardians of the springs. The gods of the Athenians demanded every year two human victims. The dark places of the earth were and are full of cruelty.

An intense sadness, surviving to our middle ages, was created by the fear of death, which still creates despair among such peasantry. Heaven, they think, is for the few who know how to win favour. The

ordinary ghost haunts the tomb, and women visit the cemetery once a week to tell the dead what the living are doing, lest they should come forth to see for themselves. There is no hope for the many of any future beyond the weary, empty existence of ghost-land. And so it was in the past, as we shall have occasion to see later. The ever-broadening hope of immortality was of very late origin among men, and so dear has it become to them, as a consolation in trouble, that their greatest fear now is lest it should be taken from them. This fear lies at the root of all prejudice against the growth of actual knowledge; and—irrational though it be—it is an impediment to happiness and progress. The study of history and of science—little as this is generally expected—does more to remove such fear than anything else. Faith that is not in accord with knowledge may lead men far astray, as we willingly admit in studying the great religions of the past. Knowledge leads to humility, but it also leads to a stronger trust in eternal purpose, which is the essence of reasonable faith.

This is not the conclusion, it is true, at which timid minds have arrived. They see no hopeful outcome in science, but rather the negation of faith. Men point to such a writer as Haeckel in Germany, and assert that—as the result of scientific study—he no longer believes in God or in the soul. But great leaders like Darwin perceived that science was injured by making it the basis of speculations which are not scientific. Science is accurate knowledge of such things as are within the limits of our experience and of our understanding. The deductions may be true or false, but when they cannot be verified by experience they are not scientific. Such knowledge had no existence in 500 B.C., when Xenophanes, or a century later when Democritus, asserted that the soul dies with the body. It is well to avoid terms to

which a false meaning has come to be attached, but Agnosticism in its true sense meets us in the Bible as much as in science. The Hebrew Psalmist who exclaimed, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me: I cannot attain to it," gave expression to the humility of thought which has always characterised the reverent East. Paul himself might be charged with Agnosticism when he says (adapting the words of the Hebrew prophet), "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard . . . the things which God hath prepared." But when Agnosticism becomes dogmatic, and declares that the limits of knowledge have been reached, we remember that Comte said the same of the stars, and that Irenæus declared certain things to be beyond human understanding, including the phases of the moon and the source of the Nile.

The great error of the Idealists, and of Hegel as a child of Plato, is said to be that they confused the existence of realities with the existence of our perception of realities, just as Kant is said by Fichte to confuse the description of the methods by which the mind receives impressions with proof of immortal individuality. Many of our doubts and confusions are due to the fact that we are not as careful as Aristotle was in defining what we mean by words. Even when we know what the original meaning was—which is not the case with many important words—we are still liable to take the simplest terms in more than one sense at the same time. For words are subject to change, to decay, and to varying import; and the ideas conveyed to us by such terms as God, soul, conscience, instinct, intuition, will, and immortality, differ not only from those of early times, but differ according to their use by the educated and the ignorant in all ages. It is difficult to think that Haeckel can justly be charged with Atheism when he says, "The will of God is at work in every falling

drop of rain and every growing crystal, in the scent of the rose and the spirit of man." If this be Pantheism, such as was taught by Greek and Indian philosophers more than two thousand years ago, what are we to say of Paul's belief in a God "who is above all and through all and in all," "in whom we live and move and have our being"? The first Christian philosopher and the modern man of science teach us apparently the same truth.

So, too, with words like Materialism and Monism: very different ideas are conveyed to different minds by the terms. If we believe that God is the Soul of the Universe, we believe that the Universe is one and indivisible. To think of the Eternal Energy in matter as being some other kind of matter is mere confusion in the use of terms. Goethe no doubt put the true thought in the fewest words when he said that "there is no matter without spirit and no spirit without matter." But if we go back to the remote ages of Asiatic civilisation we find that such ideas of energy and matter had not been conceived as yet. God and the soul alike were material and limited beings; and far from its being true that man has become materialistic in his ideas, we find that the old beliefs were less spiritual than are those of our own age, and that in times of ignorance assertion was dogmatic, while under the influence of greater knowledge man becomes more willing to admit his limited powers of understanding great mysteries beyond his experience.

Such reflections are the natural outcome of the study of human history. But to illustrate and verify the ideas it is necessary to examine them in detail by the light of modern discoveries. For history has become something very different from what it used to be. We are no longer satisfied with knowledge of great persons and of great events, or with the presentation of such subjects by ancient writers, who were some-

times ignorant, sometimes prejudiced and untruthful. History so related is full of insincerities, and sometimes of calumnies, and it gives us little opportunity of studying the great causes of events which appear to be mere accidents without purpose.[1] We desire to know what were the customs, thoughts, and interests of mankind in general which led inevitably to certain results, and which caused certain great men to succeed where others equally great had failed before. We learn these things not from political histories, but by painful study of the ancient records of events, of manners, and of beliefs which impelled men to certain actions. The wider and deeper our knowledge of such causes the surer will be our deductions as to the purpose and meaning of events. The surer also will be our conviction that what we regard as evil has its reason and its good purpose, and our hope that as in the past so in the future the very passions and errors of men will be guided to the furtherance of general good.

ii. Science.—To appreciate the difference in our attitude to history we must first remember how recent is the birth of true science, or knowledge. There is nothing that shows us better how false were the conceptions of the past than such study. The Preacher, who believed that "the thing that hath been is that which shall be," may have learned all the knowledge of his own age, but he had no conception of things which as yet had never been, or of knowledge which was not attainable when he wrote.

The Greeks in their best age (the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.) seem to have attained an accuracy of observation superior to that of the older civilised races

[1] "History is not a mere succession of events connected only by chronology. It is a chain of causes and effects."—Lecky, "History of European Morals," 1894, i. p. 332.

of Asia. It is visible in their art not less than in their thought. They looked with fresh eyes on Asiatic philosophy and science, and advanced far beyond their teachers. Thus the names of the old as well as of newer sciences have always been Greek, and the Arabs when they adopted and developed Greek ideas sometimes used Greek names for their studies. The science of mathematics, which is the only absolutely exact science—for, as De Morgan said, you cannot have a plausible solution of a mathematical problem—owed its first solid foundation to the Greeks. The Babylonians had made tables of the squares and cubes of numbers for easy reference, probably by aid of some kind of abacus or counter. The Egyptians in their later age had investigated the areas of triangles and circles, by means of the very clumsy arithmetic which we can study in existing documents. Arithmetic indeed is said to have been introduced into Greece from Egypt by Thales about 600 B.C.; but geometry was still a controversial subject when Euclid arose, after the death of Alexander the Great, and the study of conic sections traces back to Apollonius in 240 B.C. Even algebra ("the power"), though known to us by an Arab name, was attributed by the Arabs themselves to the Greek Diophantos. The power of arithmetical calculation was limited by the clumsy notation of numerals among all the ancients, until the value of place was adopted by the Indian mathematicians, resulting from the simpler notation which represented the first nine numerals by the initials of their Sanskrit names in the characters of the Indo-Bactrian alphabet. The importance of this system for the rapid calculation of large sums was evident to the Arab traders; but while the new numerals were used in India as early as 500 A.D., and by the Arabs five centuries later, they only reached Europe from the Moslems of Spain and Syria

in the twelfth century, algebra being introduced yet later, after the Crusades. The gradual diffusion of knowledge as to what we now call the lower mathematics thus required no less than a thousand years for its accomplishment, while the higher mathematics are scarcely three centuries old. Slow indeed therefore was man in learning his first *mathema* or "lesson," and in advance from his ten fingers to the triumphs of algebraic proof.

The practical Babylonians were the founders of astronomical observation, though unable to explain aright the phenomena which were all-important in their eyes. We go back to an age when man was in fear lest the sun might fail to rise or the summer to return, when he regarded sun, moon, and planets as the bodies of immortal gods of various characters, and eclipses as due to a dragon of darkness endeavouring to swallow the friendly orbs. The shepherd watching for the sun on the horizon must very early have discovered that each day it rose farther to the left as the days lengthened, or to the right as they shortened. The limits of change at the two solstices were first marked, by stones, and the central line for the equinoxes was drawn later. As early as the eleventh century B.C., the Kassite sign for the spring equinox is the segment of a circle with its arc divided into degrees. Eclipses of the moon were watched by Babylonian priests at least as early as the seventh century B.C. and the Greeks believed that they had been recorded in Babylon from the time of its foundation in 2250 B.C. The accumulation of records led to the discovery of a regular cycle of such eclipses, but the calculation sometimes failed in exactitude, as we know from an extant Babylonian report; and though Thales predicted an eclipse of the sun on May 17, 603 B.C., the Cycle of Meton connecting the solar and lunar years was not older than 432 B.C.

To the agriculturist the determination of the seasons was important, and the observation that certain stars rose at certain seasons must have been very ancient. The Pleiades are said to have been so observed in Greece as early as 850 B.C. The Zodiac (according to the latest scientific view) originated in Armenia about 3000 B.C., but the signs are not known to us as having been definitely fixed till after the Christian era, while the artificial division into twelve equal arcs is still later; and the discovery of precession was a very slow and painful result of long ages, and endless observations by puzzled astronomers, although the equinox was correctly observed in Babylon as early as the seventh century B.C. The earliest rude measurement (which we find in the Hebrew Flood story) made the year to consist of twelve months, each of thirty days. The Egyptians soon found it necessary to add five days more, and then discovered that another quarter-day was still necessary. The Babylonians found that the lunar month was less than thirty days, and introduced the clumsy method of adding from time to time a thirteenth month to keep the lunar festivals roughly in place with the seasons. This intercalation was not calculated, but decreed in consequence of actual observations. It had the one merit of not involving an accumulating error. All the early Greek calendars were taken from the Asiatics, and months of thirty days gradually gave place to true lunar months, and to intercalation, through Phœnician or Babylonian influence.

But this rude science, not based on any true understanding or scientific calculation, gave place to more accurate ideas when the Greeks began to think for themselves, though they were still hampered by the false assumption that the earth was the immovable centre of the universe. Eratosthenes taught that the world is a sphere as early as 240 B.C. Hipparchus, in

140 B.C., used latitude and longitude, and understood something of precession and of the ecliptic. But the new astronomy met with the most bitter opposition from the first. Pliny had described the earth as a sphere nearly three centuries before Augustine, who objected that men at the antipodes would not be able to see Christ descend from heaven. Chrysostom in like manner ridicules in one of his sermons the belief that the earth turns on its axis.[1] So slow is the progress of thought among mankind that it required some fifteen hundred years of observation and of argument before they were able to form a true idea of the relation of their planet to the rest of the universe, counting from the earliest age of true astronomical observation. They could not even believe that the earth was round till it was actually proved to them by Magellan's circumnavigation in 1520. It is little more than three centuries since the invention of the telescope made it possible to improve on the rude observations of the ancients, and led a century later to the great discoveries of Newton. The knowledge so painfully acquired has done more, perhaps, than any other science to revolutionise thought, not only by teaching us our true position as dwellers on a small satellite revolving round one among countless suns, but yet more in proving that the whole universe of matter is continuous, and full of one energy, and that the stars themselves are no more eternal or unchangeable than are the fleeting organisms of earth.

Yet even the genius of Newton could not rise to the abstract idea of energy in matter. The undulatory theory of light was established four generations later, and "corpuscles" became as obsolete as the phlogiston of Aristotle's age. Half a century before Young we find Voltaire puzzled by Newton's doubts as to whether rays of light were corporeal, and declaring

[1] "In Tit. Homil.," iii. 3.

that these "sparks" could not be "ordinary matter." Light, heat, sound, electricity, are, as we now know, various vibrations of matter, various forms of the one energy as measured by our limited organs and our imperfect instruments; but as we look on the rays which left some distant star when Herod was king, we learn that the matter so vibrating extends continuously to the utmost distances that our senses enable us to observe. Knowledge increases not only on account of increased intelligence and experience, but yet more through the invention of new aids to our senses. The prism shows us that the rainbow depends on the eye, and the bow in the cloud ceases to be the narrow bridge to a firmament above. The man who first discovered the use of a lens did more for us than Plato. We do not know who he was, and the date of the lens found at Nineveh is uncertain, but in Greece Aristophanes[1] knew of its use in 420 B.C., or two centuries before Archimedes; yet the microscope which reveals to us the infinitely little, like the telescope revealing the infinitely distant, was not invented till two thousand years later. Men are still staggered by the immensities so recently revealed to their senses; for three centuries represent a very short space of time in the history of slowly acquired perceptions of truth.

Even of the earth on which they dwelt, mankind, as they spread from the first centre of the most ancient civilisations, knew little till long after. The old Babylonian geography continued to be taught in Persia many centuries after the invasion of India. The Babylonian naturally regarded the world as a plain with an encircling mountain wall, beyond which was the surrounding ocean. Though the Akkadians sailed down the Persian Gulf and up the Red Sea as early as 2800 B.C., their conceptions do not seem to have

[1] "Clouds," 764.

been materially altered. Even when the Homeric poems were first sung, the lands beyond Italy were regions of mystery, and the far northern ocean coasts were the abode of ghosts. The Phœnicians and the Greek islanders discovered the end of earth when they entered the Atlantic, and about 600 B.C. Phœnician sailors circumnavigated Africa. Herodotus is thus aware that the world is much larger than the Asiatics had supposed before the time of Persian empire. By the second century after Christ, Roman knowledge of the Old World had so much increased that Marco Polo added little to it in extent even in the thirteenth century. The bold traders who steered by the pole-star, or who under Augustus reached India by aid of the monsoon, enabled Ptolemy to describe India, and Central Asia, and the Arab settlements at the mouth of the Zambesi. Japan, however, had not been heard of in Europe before Marco Polo, and the New World was unimagined in the West, though it had been discovered by the Chinese a thousand years before the advent of Columbus. The use of the compass was adopted by Europe through Arab influence in the twelfth century, and was known yet earlier in China. The final triumphs of the Portuguese and Spaniards over distance and ocean were won some four thousand years after the first sailors had ventured to coast along the shores of the Mediterranean and of the Indian Ocean.

The importance of geographical knowledge with reference to history cannot be overrated. The latest distribution of land and water is such as to give to mankind a large proportion of land in temperate climes, which appear best suited to his improvement. The great rivers of the Old World were natural high-ways leading from the Asiatic cradle to fertile valleys. The deserts were fitted by their dry invigorating air to breed hardy stocks, ever anxious, when their

numbers increased, to gain rich lands, thus securing a constant migration and mixture of human breeds; while the small corrugations of the earth's crust, which to us are mighty mountains, formed barriers behind which various tribes developed peculiarities that became valuable for the progress of later races. Pressure of population has been the main cause of civilisation, and mankind was irresistibly impelled to crowd into the better lands near the ocean, so that a quarter of the race is now confined to the comparatively small area of Europe, and another quarter to India and China. Where no such pressure existed, and the small tribes spread over boundless regions in Africa and America, the progress of the weaker stocks, driven out of better lands, was very slow. Great islands also have proved specially fitted, on account of their difficult access, for the higher development of the daring mariners who reached them from continents not too far away, and who, defended by stormy seas, could peaceably evolve freedom amid the ever-shifting conditions of continental life. Geographical and climatic conditions have thus been prime factors in the history of human progress, and over these man has practically no control.

Chemistry is another of the great sciences which owes its origin to the Greeks. Their early philosophers began, it is true, with very false conceptions of matter. They spoke of water, air, and fire, as "elements"—not knowing that the first was a chemical and the second a mechanical compound, and that fire was not matter but a vibration. They had no idea of the cell, and organic chemistry was consequently unattainable by them; but Heraclitus (about 510 B.C.) and Euripides perceived the constant flux of matter, whilst Democritus, and Empedocles in Sicily, maintained the great idea of atoms following definite laws of combination. The Arabs took from

the Greeks the name as well as the knowledge of "mixtures," and *Al-kemiah* or Alchemy was a Greek word with an Arab definite article prefixed. These early students were not intent, like later Europeans, solely on discovering the "philosopher's stone" and the "water of life." They attempted a general philosophy of existence, like their Greek masters, and Dhu-en-Nūn in Egypt (about 800 A.D.) was a religious mystic as well as an alchemist. Chemistry and distillation were introduced into Europe by Spanish Moslems in the twelfth century, and Roger Bacon the Franciscan—one of the most enlightened men of his age—based his chemistry, in the latter half of the thirteenth century, on the teaching of the Greek and Arab philosophers. To them also Cornelius Agrippa in the fifteenth century and Paracelsus in the sixteenth were deeply indebted. Much vain research was devoted to the transmutation of metals, which Pliny mentions in our first century, and which Diocletian forbade in 296 A.D. But unconsciously men were led, by an enthusiasm often of ignorance, to discoveries far more valuable than gold. After studies pursued for more than two thousand years, the doctrine of the conservation of matter was established at the close of the eighteenth century, and before the middle of the nineteenth Mayer declared the principle of the conservation of force. Progress in chemistry, like that in other sciences, has depended on the improvement of instruments, from the early thermometer of Galileo down to the countless machines for measuring temperatures inconceivably extreme, or for determining electric volumes and densities, which, since the seventeenth century, have gradually increased in delicacy of construction. But perhaps the greatest result of chemical and physical study has been the escape from the old fallacy which distinguished "dead matter"—the inorganic—from organic or "living

matter." We have learnt that there is no matter in the universe which is devoid of energy, and this discovery renders easier the conception of the origin of life, by breaking down the barrier between the organic and the inorganic. We learn also, by the use of the spectroscope, that—as far as we may judge—the materials of which the most distant stars are composed are the same as those known to us on our own planet; and we perceive that matter—indestructible but ever changing—is instinct with an eternal energy, for ever acting on new combinations of atoms. Whether we are content with the old chemical unit, or subdivide it into electrons infinitely minute, we still are forced to admit that no single unit can exist save in connection with the whole, and that (as Goethe perceived) there is no matter without spirit, and no spirit that is not an energy thrilling some form of matter, whether perceptible to our senses, or imperceptible and thus unknown.

The study of organic beings, to which we give the name of Natural History, has always been very slowly pursued, and the beginnings were due to the curiosity of Asiatics. The Assyrians in the seventh century B.C. made lists of plants and animals, as Solomon is said to have done a few centuries earlier. Their conquests made them acquainted with new and strange forms. Even the kings of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, more than five centuries before Solomon, collected rare beasts and birds. Alexander sent home to Aristotle, who may be regarded as the father of natural science, the new animals that he found in the East; and the interest taken by the Ptolemies in this great subject is shown, not only by the strange monsters from Africa which they paraded in the streets of Alexandria, but by the paintings on Greek tombs of the Ptolemaic age, recently found in the south of Palestine, where each

beast—such as the porcupine or the rhinoceros—bears its name above it in Greek.

The writings of Aristotle, of Pliny, and of the early Christian philosophers, are full, it is true, of strange superstitions due to imperfect observation of the habits of animals. The belief in omens, and in transmigration, served to maintain ancient interest in the science, and botany was studied for medical purposes from the time of Dioscorides, or about 50 A.D. In the thirteenth century we find Jacques de Vitry as much interested in Syrian fauna and flora as was Abu el Faraj, who wrote on the nature of birds, beasts, fishes, and reptiles, or Kaswini the Arab Linnæus, who examined the Lebanon flora. Henry I. of England collected a menagerie from abroad as early as 1115 A.D., and the "Bestiaries" of the middle ages described the characters of animals long before Pierre Belon, under Edward VI., of England, printed his researches in Mediterranean lands, with spirited woodcuts representing various beasts. Even he is unable to escape the ancient superstitions, and gives us a drawing of the flying serpents of Sinai; but in these early attempts we find the germ of the great science which has so rapidly developed during the last hundred years.

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century three distinct lines of research had been undertaken—the study of anatomy by Cuvier, that of the embryo by Von Baer, and that of geology by Lyell; but although Lamarck, in 1809, taught the gradual growth of species from primitive forms, it is admitted by all that the year 1859, when Darwin published his "Origin of Species," marks an epoch in the history of natural science. A theory is confirmed when it is shown to agree with an entirely independent result based on a separate line of study; it is verified when a third line of induction is shown to lead to the same conclusion. The

strength of the doctrine of evolution lies in the coincidence of the deductions drawn from the studies of geology, embryology, and comparative anatomy. Darwin was concerned, not with speculative philosophy nor with religious belief, but with the legitimate conclusions to be deduced from an immense accumulation of facts, due to patient study, in each of the three mutually helpful lines of research. The great principles which he deduced, as to the slow and imperceptible change of form in living organisms, due to the surrounding circumstances beyond their control, as to the struggle for existence, heredity, preference, reversion, the extinction of some kinds and the rapid spread of others more adaptable, were principles not confined to the history of species, but found applicable to the whole question of growth and decay, bodily and mental, to human beliefs and institutions not less than to the gradual and orderly development of living things.[1] The speculations of the ancients were thus judged according to results based on a deeper and more accurate knowledge of nature. The microscope especially served to establish the growth of all organisms, animal or vegetable, from the microscopic cells unknown to Greek philosophers, which Matthias Schlieden first observed in 1838. The conclusions of Huxley (in 1863) and of Darwin (in 1871) as to man's place in nature, and as to his gradual rise from earlier apelike ancestors, have not only never as yet been shown to be false, but they have been confirmed by new discoveries, such as those due to the study of the placenta, as noted by Haeckel, or of the blood of man and the apes studied by Friedenthal in 1902. Natural

[1] The term "evolution" was used as early as about 1677, in Hale's "Origin of Mankind," pp. 33, 63. See Skeat, "Dictionary," 1888, *s.v.* "Evolve." Herbert Spencer, in his autobiography, honestly admits that he did not perceive the general application of the idea of evolution till after 1859.

history was originally studied from motives of curiosity or of superstition, but man has been led thereby to a truer conception of his place in the universe, and to the appreciation of the infinite patience, order, and variety in which we may perceive the purpose working throughout the ages.

There are three sciences which may be regarded as quite modern and unknown to the ancients, but which are all of high value in the study of history—namely, Geology, Archæology, and Philology—as to which a few words may be added. Xenophanes, and Pliny six centuries later, had observed fossils in the rocks, but such remains were generally regarded as those of former giants and dragons, and created only a vague curiosity concerning their relation to the legends and myths of the poets. Voltaire, in 1764, laughs at "systems founded on shells," and at the reindeer and hippopotamus discovered at Estampes. He was willing to admit that many ages were required to account for proved revolutions in the condition of the earth, but his ignorance of the new science, and his attempts to explain away the early observations on which it was founded, now strike us with astonishment at his prejudice. The Geological Society of London was, however, not founded till 1807, and that of France dates only from 1830, when Lyell had become the first exponent of modern principles in the study of geology.

As astronomy has accustomed us to the ideas of almost inconceivable distance and size, or chemistry to equally immense ranges of cold and heat, so the study of the rocks accustoms us to the conception of immense lapse of time. Whether we calculate the deposit of sediment to have averaged only about an inch in a century, or whether we suppose that in the earlier ages of terrific storms and extreme temperatures, of torrential rains and huge floods, the sedi-

mentary action was more rapid and the volcanic forces more active, we are still forced to admit that many millions of years must have been necessary for the deposit of more than a hundred thousand feet of strata covering the ancient volcanic crust of earth. During about half this time the organisms existing on land or in the sea were simple and lowly forms, and vertebrate animals had not as yet appeared. The gradual progress from early fishes to the amphibia, reptiles, marsupials, and other later mammals, seems to have been accelerated as time went on, till we reach the period when huge land and water beasts, with small brains, seem to have been useful during ages of storm in preparing the rough surfaces, the great forests and swamps, for the appearance of man. Gradually they were superseded by animals with larger brains, and perished for lack of the immense quantities of food which they must have required. Not that they alone were the denizens of ancient earth, for the butterfly and the dragon-fly are found in the coal measures, while delicate shells have survived other species apparently far stronger and of much greater size. The utility of some of these monsters, and the reasons why some species perished while others survived from an immense antiquity, are still obscure to our understanding; but the purpose which continually produced higher forms from older and simpler animals is clearly proved by science, and forbids us to suppose that such progress was either accidental or unintelligent. Conclusions as to age founded on imperfect information may be modified by further research. The mylodon sloth, in Patagonia, is found to have survived to a quite recent historic period. The Siberian mammoth may have existed also very late, the Irish elk roamed in Britain in the time of Cæsar, as did the reindeer and the aurochs in the German forests; but such modifications will not serve to

support the belief that man suddenly appeared on earth only about six thousand years ago. Human history cannot, it is true, be studied earlier than that time, because there is no true history before the appearance of written records; but long prehistoric ages must have preceded the invention of writing. The first chapter of the Hebrew Book of Genesis contains no indication of the age when man was believed to have first appeared as "male and female." The ideas of our fathers were founded on a single sentence, and the Babylonians, with whom the Hebrews so closely agreed in traditionary beliefs, supposed immense periods of unknown human history to have preceded that of the first civilised race. Their calculations were entirely speculative, and even now our knowledge of early man is very defective; but his existence before land and water had reached their present levels can no longer be regarded as improbable by students of science.

Archæology is the study of man in the past, and it becomes a science only when studied on scientific principles. It stands in the same relation to literary criticism that is held by natural science with regard to early philosophic speculation. But so recent is the birth of this line of research that the importance of the change has even now not been generally recognised. Ancient remains have always been interesting to cultivated men, and Assur-bani-pal of Assyria was a great collector of old records, cylinders, and medals; but his objects were political and religious rather than historical. Raphael was placed in charge of Roman antiquities, and got drawings of others from Italy, Greece, and Turkey, but Leo X. was mainly interested in classic antiques from an artistic standpoint. Scientific archæology depends on the decipherment of forgotten scripts, and may, perhaps, be said to date from the discovery of a bilingual in Greek

and Phœnician by the famous Abbé Barthélemy in 1758.

Our first Antiquarian Society was founded in 1770; but dilettanti had even then no conception of the stores of information buried in the earth in Asia, Egypt, Italy, Greece, or Western Europe. Voltaire considered the early history of Egypt to be permanently lost; for the great discoveries of Champollion date only from 1820, while Rawlinson's first memoir on the Persian cuneiform was not published till 1836. In 1825 only about a hundred archaic Greek texts were known, while the corpus of Greek inscriptions, including ten thousand, is now far behind actual discoveries of later years. Progress in such research has gone on with ever-increasing rapidity, as thousands of brick tablets pour annually into the museums, while Egypt yields the contents of its tombs and the torn papyri once cast aside as rubbish. The important Safa alphabet was not deciphered till 1877, and the Sabean texts began to be published two years later. The Cypriote characters were read by George Smith in 1880, and became the foundation of a new branch of palæography—the study of a script used by Greeks in Crete and in Spain, as well as in Asia Minor and at Mycenæ, based on the old hieroglyphics of the Syrian Hittites, and developing into the Phœnician and other alphabets which still need further examination.

The literary study of Oriental books is equally modern as a branch of science. Researches in Arabic, and the reading of the Koran, were discouraged by the Popes, and Roger Bacon in the thirteenth century said that there were not five men in Europe who could read Arabic. Hyde attempted the study of Persian antiquities as early as 1700, but Anquetil Duperron was condemned, when he presented the Zendavesta to Europe in 1771, by scholars who were something more than mere pedants; and ill-informed

controversies continued until the genuineness and antiquity of these books were proved by the discoveries of Rawlinson. The study of Sanskrit, and of the laws and philosophies of India, has been equally accelerated since the beginning of the nineteenth century, when as yet the local alphabets and dialects of that great country were unknown in Europe. The outcome of all such patient research has been the foundation of a comparative study of religions which even now is yet in its infancy, and which is destined to produce results of the highest importance.

Philology, or "word-love," is also a science of modern origin, and of an importance to history as yet not fully appreciated. Voltaire satirised the attempts at comparative research made in his own time. Sir William Jones studied the connection of Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit as early as 1770, but when Bopp first published his "Comparative Grammar" of the Aryan languages, his work was received with ridicule and scorn, by scholars, as late as 1833. Grimm's laws of pronunciation, in related languages of Europe growing out of early dialects, have become the basis of scientific study. The labours of Donner, Castrén, Böhtlingk, and Vámbéry, have shown the connection of widely-separated Turanian tongues springing from the ancient Akkadian; but even as late as 1883, when F. Delitzsch wrote on the results of Rawlinson's discoveries, the value of Assyrian for comparative study of Semitic languages was little recognised, while the further advance to general comparison of the historic languages—Egyptian, Semitic, Turanian, and Aryan—is still regarded with the same suspicion with which the discoveries of Bopp were received. These questions will demand detailed consideration in tracing the migrations of prehistoric man, for it is by language alone that we are able to arrive at any true conclusions as to the facts of his dispersion over earth.

These, then, are the great sciences which have slowly developed from the rude observations of the early Asiatics, and which are all-important to the study of the rise of man. If we are content to draw deductions from known facts, not attempting to twist the facts in support of preconceived theories and prejudices, we may hope to attain to truths unsuspected in the ages when such knowledge had not yet been acquired. Human reason is limited by the imperfections of the human understanding; and not even the science of mathematics can be regarded as perfectly understood. The information in other cases—such as geology or archæology—is fragmentary, and often difficult to understand; but those who turn their backs to the light, and—as in Plato's famous simile—insist on conjectures founded on the shadows cast on the walls of their cave, when they might stand up and face the realities behind them, can never hope to be guided to knowledge of the truth.

CHAPTER II

EARLY MAN

i. **Natural.**—We look out on the universe as it were from behind prison bars, with knowledge limited by our imperfect senses. There are rays of light which the eye cannot see, and sounds which the ear cannot hear. We are surrounded with matter—the air we breathe—that is imperceptible to any of our senses. It is only by the use of aids to our organs that we attain to more accurate knowledge of facts. Philosophers, from the first Greeks to the latest Europeans, have discussed the "mind" without any true understanding of the machine which receives impressions from without, and which records them as experiences within. We speak of thought as a function of the brain, forgetting that its nerve centres are powerless if disconnected from the corresponding centres of the spinal cord. The invention of a new stain, and a few experiments on living monkeys, have done more to explain to us the true nature of thought than all the logic of the philosophers; and it is not more than thirty years since such researches commenced, and since Ferrier's "Functions of the Brain" was written. Even now there are large tracts of this organ of which the exact use remains unknown.

As far as we know now, much of the brain is devoted to mechanical action—the upper part to the movement of the limbs, the front central part to that of the eyes, mouth, and tongue. In front of this extend the lobes

which receive the vibrations which we recognise as odours. At the sides of the brain the vibrations of sound are taken in, and at the back are recorded those of vision received from the retina-curtain of the eye. All these vibrations are recorded and balanced near the cerebellum, which contains the delicate batteries on which memory depends. Each experience consists of a particular combination of impressions due to sight, sound, odour, and other vibrations, and when this combination is repeated the original experience is recalled.

Consciousness of that which is without the individual organism, and action due to such consciousness, are thus dependent on the healthy action of these nerve centres in the body; and to say that consciousness ceases with death is only to say that the body ceases to be the material organ in which the energy which has thrilled it for a time can act. But to identify this energy with the consciousness which it produced is a logical fallacy, and to suppose that it begins to exist when the new organism is produced, or that it ceases to exist when the organism is worn out, is directly contrary to the scientific law of the conservation of energy. The electric lamp grows dimmer and is broken while the electric force remains constant. The lamp goes out, and the force is sent into another or into other lamps; but though we may not know where it is acting we know that it has not ceased to thrill some other machine, or some other form of matter. Science is silent at death, because science is but the accurate study of experience. It does not claim to explain to us the great mystery of that which follows.

But that the energy of life is constant we are well assured. When the organism has reached its fullest development, and is at its best, we see this energy in its most harmonious action. Worn by the count-

less impressions from without, the body becomes less capable, and the friction increases until the machine breaks down; but this material individuality is not the energy which acts therein. That the stored memories cease with death is evident, for they become exhausted even in life when not revived by repetition. We have but to read the letters of twenty years ago to find how much we have forgotten, and the constant flux of matter involves a constant change of consciousness. But from the moment when the two parent cells unite to infuse a double dose of life into the new cell then produced, the energy within works with a positive fury of action, which, in a few months, whirls the individual through an ancestral experience of millions of years, producing all those inherited peculiarities which we call instincts, and innate (or according to Aristotle intuitive) ideas. The new being created from living cells receives a shock at birth which retards the rapidity of such development. It begins at once to receive countless external impressions from its surroundings; and its character depends henceforth, yet more than while still attached to the parent organism, on the surrounding circumstances which form its experience. It is incapable of knowing or understanding anything which does not reach it by its organs of sense, and imagination is only the revival of its actual experiences. Locke truly perceived that "there is nothing in the intellect that has not first been in the sense"—or experience of the individual. Of forces, and of forms of matter, which cannot be measured by the nerve centres the organism can know nothing. Yet we learn, when increasing our powers by mechanical aids, that the universe is full of both matter and energy not perceptible by our natural organs. The brain itself testifies to former conditions which have become obsolete, by its preservation of the pineal gland which

is now apparently useless, which in existing lizards is a blind eye, and which in the plesiosaurus seems to have been actually a third organ of vision.

The "mind," therefore, is clearly the aggregate of all the experiences of the individual organism, including those which it derives from its ancestral history, and from the education which begins at the moment of birth. But ideas which we regard as innate are more often the results of the customs and beliefs that surround us; and the experience of thousands of years of human history is bestowed on the new individual in its latest quintessence. It is not only man who thus profits from the past: even animals whose brains are less developed, and less widely sensitive, appear to have increased in intelligence since the times of the early monsters whose brains were so small compared with their bulk. Broca calculated[1] that even between the twelfth and the nineteenth centuries the size of the average adult brain in France had perceptibly increased, and the intelligence of a race is found in all cases to depend on the development of the head, and on the increase of surface in all parts of the brain due to the depth of its corrugations. Man has thus gradually increased not only in experience and knowledge, but also in capacity for understanding the realities with which he is surrounded. The main duty of the individual is the transmission to its offspring of experience, but the effect of such experience on the eternal energy itself is the great secret which science cannot tell us.

ii. Prehistoric Remains.—It is remarkable that, as yet, we know less of the early history of mankind from discovery of fossil, or semi-fossilised, remains than we do of the development of some other animals. The evolution of the elephant's trunk is traced (by

[1] Darwin, "Descent of Man," i. p. 240.

aid of recent discoveries in Egypt and elsewhere) through countless years from the snout of the earliest pig-like ancestor; the pedigree of the horse, from the little four-toed progenitor that ran among the reeds, is as clearly followed out by naturalists; but of man we have only a few scattered relics on which to found ideas of his origin and growth. America has not furnished any generally accepted evidence of man's existence at an early geologic age, nor have remains been discovered in Africa of human fossil bones. In Western Asia there are bone caves with stalagmitic floors still unbroken to be examined, but so far the results of Asiatic exploration have been practically useless in the caves where beasts now extinct have been found. Actual skulls of prehistoric man are as yet only known in the west of Europe, and all these belong to the neolithic age, when polished stone weapons were in use. As regards the unpolished flints of the palæolithic ages, on which theories as to the immense antiquity of the race depend, there are many difficulties to be overcome: for the eoliths, which some men of science regard as evidence of human activity, are by others supposed—in some cases at least—to have been formed by natural causes. The use of rude flint weapons is not in itself a mark of high antiquity. Tribes have coexisted whose stone instruments were of very various finish. Not only had the Canaanites in the sixteenth century B.C. stone axes long after all the metals were known in Asia, but the Ethiopians in the army of Xerxes had arrows tipped with stone in 480 B.C.,[1] while the jade axes of Australians and Polynesians are still in use. Europe remained savage long after Asia was civilised, and bronze was introduced by the Mediterranean traders and unknown (except in Greece) till about 1500 B.C., while it probably did not

[1] Herodotus, vii. 69.

reach Britain till about 600 B.C. at earliest. For bronze was gradually improved by the addition of an increasing percentage of tin to the copper, and did not reach its final proportions till about the seventh century B.C., as has been shown by the study of dated samples. In India, in Spain, and in Italy pure copper was used before bronze, and the bronze of our round barrows cannot be regarded as either very early or as of native manufacture. Shortly before the Christian era an overland trade with Marseilles[1] brought the Cornish tin to Italy, and from such traders bronze weapons and vessels were apparently obtained by Britons. The distinction between "ages" of rough stone, polished stone, and bronze weapons is thus not chronological, but local; and represents the gradual progress of races which were prehistoric only because they were still savage, those with the best weapons driving out the less civilised to worse or more distant regions.

Rude stone axes and knives show therefore a rude race, but other circumstances are to be considered before we can determine the age of such remains. With the exception of worked flints, we have no sound argument to show the presence of man till some time after the latest glacial period in Europe. Our information is almost entirely confined to western Europe,[2] and it is still of a most imperfect and fragmentary character. In 1891 Du Bois discovered, on the banks of the Bengawan river, in Java, a small human skull, very flat, and with strongly marked brow ridges. In capacity it is about half-way between that of an ape and that of a European of

[1] Diodorus, V. ii. Max Müller (see his "Life and Letters," 1902, ii. pp. 289–292) notes the value of Wibel's study of bronze in 1892. Asiatic bronze of various ages has been analysed by Dr. Gladstone.

[2] See Taylor, "Origin of the Aryans"; Beddoe, "Rhind Lectures"; Denniker, "Races of Man"; Darwin, "Descent of Man"; Hutchinson, "Living Races of Mankind."

the present time. It lay among volcanic lapilli; and within twenty yards of the spot were found a human femur which apparently had belonged to a much larger individual, and two human teeth. Considering how many bones of early animals were here discovered, it is remarkable that the human remains recovered were so few; and the age to which they are to be attributed remains uncertain. In West Asia the earliest known skull—that of a short-headed girl in the lower strata of Troy—belongs to a time when men had already learned to build with stone. The Canaanite skulls from Gezer, which denote a Semitic race, are probably not older than about 2000 B.C. The lake villages of Switzerland and North Italy were still inhabited as late as 1500 B.C.; and Herodotus speaks of such a village at Lake Prasias in Thrace, while those of Ireland come down to a time when iron was known, and iron was not used even in Gaul before 400 B.C. Our earlier information has been mainly due to French researches, and it was not till 1847 that McEnery found a human jawbone, accompanying the relics of extinct animals, under the upper stalagmite floor of Kent's Cavern.

But as early as 1700 A.D. a flat-headed skull was discovered at Canstadt, near Stuttgardt, and was said to be associated with bones of the mammoth; and since 1774, when Esper explored the Gailenreuth caves in Bavaria, the number of such early remains has steadily increased. We cannot, however, suppose that early savages shared their caves with the bear, the hyena, or the tiger; and though found buried at a depth of five feet at Engis (by Schmerling in 1873), the human bones showed no marks of having been gnawed. There is no doubt that man not only lived in ages when the mammoth was still to be found in northern Europe, and when the reindeer existed in

France, but that he had attained to a degree of intelligence which enabled him to sketch the outlines of these beasts recognisably on bones of the mammoth and horns of the deer, as is shown by the examples from the Dordogne Valley—the caves of Le Moustier and La Madeleine. But the interesting point, still to be proved, is whether such conditions may not have existed in a comparatively late age. In Russia the actual flesh, hide, and red hair of mammoths have been found more than once preserved in the ice. The European bison, and the reindeer,[1] were still to be found in German forests in the time of Cæsar; and increased civilisation, or ruthless hunting, may have led to the extermination of such beasts, rather than any great change in climatic conditions. Students of the subject suppose that Neolithic man—as represented by remains in caves, in river gravels, in lake villages, and in the shell mounds of Denmark—may be traced back for ten thousand or even twenty thousand years. As to his predecessors of the Palæolithic age, whom Mortillet thought to have existed two hundred and forty thousand years ago, we have no information at all, since not a single skull or bone has been found, and the only evidence is that of rude flints, which, in some cases at least, are now supposed not to have been shaped by human hands.

The prehistoric types of European men in the Neolithic stage include four or five distinct classes, usually regarded as belonging to different races. The remains are few, and the skull cannot tell us what language the man spoke, or what was the colour of his hair and of his skin. It is only by tracing the survival of such types in the later dolmen graves, and in the living races of our own times, that any further information is to be gained; and it is only

[1] Cæsar, "De Bello Gallico," vi. 23.

in a very few cases that the comparative antiquity of the types can be studied. The first type represents a tall race with a remarkably flat skull—long and receding—once supposed to indicate a very inferior intelligence. It includes the famous Neanderthal specimen (found near Düsseldorf in 1857), with those of Spy and Canstadt, and that found near Colmar in Alsace, in 1867, in connection with mammoth bones. The Spy type occurs also in French, English, and Irish dolmen chambers, and is known in the Pyrenees, Bohemia, Moravia, and North Italy. The modern type to which it corresponds is that of the tall fair Scandinavian race. The flat head also characterises the race which built the Guernsey dolmens; and they not only possessed beautifully polished weapons of stone brought to the island from Spain, but also pottery, which they ornamented rudely with patterns.

Even in the caves, remains of beads show that this race was not altogether without intelligence, and the type survived down to the middle ages. The skull of Saint Mansuel, apostle to the Belgic Gauls and bishop of Toul in Lorraine, is quite as flat, and presents quite the outline of the Neanderthal skull. Robert Bruce appears also to have inherited this Norman type of head; and indeed in the twelfth century a large round head seems to have been exceptional among Norman nobles. Henry II. of England (according to Peter of Blois) was considered remarkable because "his head was round as in token of great wit."

The second type, apparently connected with the first, presents a somewhat higher cranium, the race being tall and long-headed. It was discovered at Engis (in 1833), on the left bank of the Meuse, eight miles south-west of Liége, together with remains of the mammoth and reindeer, and with a fragment of pottery. This specimen belongs to the same region

that was occupied by the first type, since Engis is only seventy miles south-west of Neanderthal. Another tall long-headed people is represented by the Cromagnon remains, and those of Aurignac and other caves. They were somewhat prognathous (like negroes and some Mongols), and the head was fairly high. They were fishers and hunters, using bone needles probably to sew skins as clothing. They adorned themselves with collars and bracelets of shells. They were acquainted with fire, and appear to have buried the dead with care, placing food and weapons beside them, like the Guernsey flat-headed people, who, in their cemeteries, put fish and meat in pottery vessels, beside the carefully stacked corpses of men, women, and children of the tribe. The tall races seem to have belonged mainly to Northern Europe, though a skeleton measuring 5 ft. 9 in. in height was found by Dr. Rivière at Mentone, buried to a depth of twenty feet, with unpolished flint implements and remains of extinct animals.

The third type occurs at Grenelle, near Paris, in the gravels of the Seine. The oldest population at this site was of the Scandinavian or first type. These savages were followed by others of the Cromagnon race, and yet later by a small, sturdy, short-headed people, who have been compared to the Lapps and Finns. They may have separated from the main stock, and may have been driven west by the stronger races. The skull resembles that of the oldest skeleton at Troy. The race appears to have spread over part of France, and to have existed in Auvergne. It may reasonably be supposed to have been that of the ancestors of the true, or pure, short-headed Basques.

The fourth type is probably later, and represents a southern race along the north shores of the Mediterranean, gradually moving north, and crossing into Britain from France. This type, found at Troy later

than the short-headed people, and in the Genista cave of Gibraltar, as well as in the English "long barrows," which were made by a people unacquainted with the use of metals, presents a delicate frame, a long head, and a stature of about 5 ft. 5 in.—or two inches more than the Lapp-like race of Auvergne. The small dark Welshman, and some natives of Kerry and of the Hebrides, present this fourth type, which occurs also in France, Belgium and Spain. The Lapp-like people are unknown in Britain, but the "long barrow" race are found from Wiltshire to Caithness, and they appear to be connected with a Keltic stock in all cases.

The fifth type belongs to historic times, at the beginning of the bronze age in Britain. It represents a tall, powerful people with short heads, who may be the Belgæ of Cæsar's time—a vigorous, fair, light-haired race, akin to the Germans who were noted by the Romans for stature and yellow or red hair. To the present day the prevailing type of central Europe is short-headed, and some of the fair Danes are remarkably so. The Belgic race in Britain drove the feebler "long barrow" people westwards, and spread to Scotland as Caledonians. It is possible that this vigorous stock was a mixed race, springing from the older short and long-headed races of Europe. Slavs in Russia, and the Teutons, within historic times, have mingled with Turanian stocks—Tartar and Ugric, Finnic and Basque—and the ancient Belgæ may in like manner have mingled with the Lapp-like race, which seems once to have been widely spread in Europe, and which they drove before them to the west. Early skulls in Portugal belong to the short-headed Finnic race, and the modern Basques are believed to show the mixture of Kelts and Latins with an original Finnic stock, still represented among them by a short-headed type.

The evidence thus available is almost entirely con-

fined to Europe, where sparse populations existed very early. It throws little light on the question of the original home and original type of man. In the future, when the bone caves of Armenia and Syria have been explored like those of Europe, evidence may be gathered which may profoundly affect racial questions. The great geological discoveries in the Fayyum have given no indication of the existence of man at a very early period. Africa and America alike seem to have been empty of human beings in such ages. Dr. Lund, in 1842, examined eight hundred caves in Brazil, and in six cases only were human bones found, the type being similar to that of the American Indians: even in the one case where remains of extinct animals were found in the cave, the strata were disturbed, and the burial of the human skeleton appears to have occurred at a later period.

The shape of the head is generally regarded as being one of the most invariable characteristics of race. It is said to depend on the shape of the pelvis of the mother, which in turn would depend on the conditions of existence. It is clear that the skull is sometimes gradually modified from a medium measurement to extremes of length, breadth, and height. In the coldest regions of the north and of the south alike we find abnormally long heads—among Esquimaux and Patagonians. The Australian savages have the longest heads of all, while the Negritos and Malays have very short ones, like the Lapps in the far north of Europe. The negro generally is long-headed, while the ancient Egyptian, the Semitic, and the South Aryan races approach more closely to the medium measurement. The European skull has an average capacity of more than a tenth in excess of that of the Australian savage. The Asiatic and the American Indian are intermediate between these extremes of 92·3 and 81·9 cubic inches. But the average European skull of the twelfth century

in France appears to have been smaller than that of the modern Asiatic. These indications seem to point to the divergence of the various types of head from an originally medium type in a central position—or in the more temperate regions of Asia. In the absence, however, of any very definite indications to be gathered from prehistoric remains or from the study of the mixed races of the modern world, we may turn to those deductions which may legitimately follow a study of human language.

iii. **Language.**—Infant attempts at speech consist of imitative cries accompanied by gestures; and when we find ourselves among a people whose language is unknown, we are at once reduced to the same methods of communication. There can be no reasonable doubt that the origin of all human speech was of this nature: for gesture and dramatic action still play an important part in conversation among savages. The Bushman in South Africa, whose vocabulary is meagre, is remarkable for dramatic powers; the Akka dwarfs are said to be unable to converse with one another in the dark, when gestures cannot be seen; the Italians will conduct a conversation entirely by sign-language, without uttering a word; and the Arabs also use well-known signs to enforce their meaning. By aid of gesture the particular meaning of the imitative sound was thus made more clearly intelligible.

In the oldest languages such imitation of natural sounds is most clearly recognisable. The Egyptians called the sheep *ba*, the dog *fufu* (or "bow-wow"), and the wind *shu*. But the occurrence of such words in various languages is not certain evidence of the common origin of all speech. When we find that the Egyptian and the Chinese alike call the cat *mau*, we may think that these nations—never in contact with one another—independently imitated the cat's "mew."

The study of nouns, in even the oldest speech, will not lead to any certain conclusions, because even the oldest known languages—Egyptian and Babylonian—are full of words borrowed from other tongues. But all languages are derived from simple syllables which we call "roots," and which represent the original exclamation or imitative cry; and if it can be proved that these roots—from each of which, by combination of two or more, endless words were formed—are really the same in the various known languages, and especially in the oldest, we have a safe foundation for comparative study.

The Aryan languages were the first to be compared, and were reduced by Fick to about four hundred and fifty original roots. But Max Müller observed that these include so many which have a common origin that Aryan speech can be simplified to a list of not more than a hundred and fifty or two hundred original monosyllabic roots. The Turanian languages have also been reduced by Donner, Vámbéry, Castrén,[1] and other scholars, to about two hundred original stems; and it is very important to observe that the greater part of these are to be found in Akkadian—the oldest language of Mesopotamia—and, moreover, that the simple original roots are the same in Aryan and Turanian speech, so that the original unity of these two families of language has already been admitted by Anderson, Cuno, and Isaac Taylor.

Comparisons between Semitic and Aryan roots were made by Gesenius and by F. Delitzsch; but it has always been thought doubtful if the "triliteral" Semitic roots could be regarded as of the same nature with the monosyllabic roots of the northern tongues. A careful study of the fifteen hundred

[1] Donner, "Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachen," 1874; Vámbéry, "Turko-Tatarischen Sprachen," 1874.

roots found in Hebrew and Assyrian alike shows, however, that only about five hundred are "perfect"—that is to say, formed by three consonants—and that these are in fact double roots, used (just as in Chinese) to make the meaning more certain. The remainder—called "defective," "quiescent," and "double"—may easily be shown to have been originally monosyllables, especially by the imperative of the verbs, which represents the original exclamation. Semitic languages still contain a large proportion of monosyllabic words; and a comparison with Egyptian, which is admitted to have had a common origin with Semitic speech,[1] proves to us that the southern languages also were developed from monosyllabic roots, while these again are found to be the same in the majority of cases which have been established for the northern family. Detailed examination thus proves the fact that some two hundred stems are common to all Asiatic speech, and discoverable in the earliest known tongues—Egyptian and Akkadian.

But the comparison may be extended even further; and about fifty simple roots will be found to run through the whole known languages of the world, being common not only to Egyptian and Akkadian, to Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian speech, but also traceable in the American and African tongues, in Malay, Dravidian, and Polynesian speech.[2]

From such comparisons we obtain some interesting indications of the earliest condition of man. Most of the words really common to all races refer to natural objects and actions. Man had already some conception

[1] As is shown by syntax and by vocabulary, especially in the case of the names of colours, which represent a very characteristic peculiarity in any language.

[2] See R. P. Greg, "Comparative Philology," 1893. His vocabularies sometimes require correction, but are reliable as a whole.

of "spirits" connected with the breath: he seems to have had flocks or herds kept in enclosures, and to have used boats made out of trees: his tools and weapons were of stone: he dwelt by rivers among woods, and probably ate fish, and dreaded snakes. As regards other animals, however, we can reach no conclusions of value. The ass, for instance, has a common name (*a-a* in Egyptian), derived from its bray; but the home of the ass is in South Asia and Africa, and it was not introduced into Europe till the bronze age. Names for the lion seem also to have been borrowed from Semitic speech, and names of birds, such as the cuckoo, may have been independently taken from the distinctive call.

The oldest exclamations seem to have been formed only by one part of the mouth, and (as among animals) these cries were recognisable by tone as denoting satisfaction or distress. But man, whose advance has been due to that imitative faculty which also led him so early to scratch rude sketches of various objects (and later enabled him to draw the mammoth) aided his exclamations by signs, and increased his vocabulary by double roots, apparently before the separation of the various families or tribes whence nations sprang. True speech may be said to appear when double cries, formed in different parts of the mouth, have been combined into one sound; and no animal (not even the parrot or the magpie) has the power of uttering such sounds. The old roots may be classified under a few heads, all apparently imitative of natural noises. The simplest sound, *au*, not only denotes grief, but also the howling of the wind, as surviving in the Babylonian; while *ha* or *ah* was an exclamation calling attention, and developed early words for "behold." Thus the Arab to-day, indicating some distant object, points to it and utters the reduplicated exclamation "ha-ha-ha." The third

vowel-sound, *eh* or *he*, very generally occurs as a grunt of interrogation. A hissing sound, *es* or *se*, was also used to call attention, and represents in early speech the hissing of the breath, of wind, water, or fire. Tapping noises, represented by the dental *ta*, include roots for striking, stamping, and falling, while sharp cries are indicated by the guttural *ka*, and choking noises by *gha*. The puffing sounds denote the idea of breathing and inflation, and from them are derived words for being, growth, and wind. Bleating and bellowing sounds, such as *ba* and *bu*, not only signify sheep and cows, but are also extended to mean "speech"; and roaring sounds, such as *ar*, not only imitate the growl of the dog, the roar of the lion, the sounds of rushing water and flames, but thence come to apply to angry or powerful men, and to strength or bigness; while on the other hand a liquid sound, *li* or *ri*, denotes the trickle of water, and is extended to ideas of weakness. The common words *pa* and *ma*, for father and mother, may be regarded merely as baby cries; but a root *mu* or *vu* seems to originate in sucking sounds, and was extended to mean life and growth. The oldest secondary roots seem to include *tak* for "stone," derived from its ringing sound, *vap* for bird—"the flapper"—and *pat* for the patter of feet and the stamping of clay. Thus some twelve distinct sounds not only served—by aid of signs—to denote everything that is perceptible by the ear, but also ideas of sight and of size, in cases where there was no sound at all.

Very curious interchanges of sounds which to us appear very distinct are to be traced in all languages: these became distinctive of the early dialects whence languages developed, and they thus form a valuable guide in the comparative study of related families of speech. Delicate distinctions of sound increased with

increasing brain-power, and the oldest languages have the fewest of such distinctions. To the present day the Bechuana are unable to distinguish *d* from *l* and *r*, and in Egyptian the two latter are denoted by one letter. The Chinese *l* is the Japanese *r*, and the Turkish *t* is the Finnish *l*, while even in early Aryan speech *d* takes the place of both *l* and *r*. The Hebrew *h* becomes the Assyrian *s*, and the Hebrew *sh* the Aramean *th*. The Greek and Persian *h* is also the Latin and Sanskrit initial *s*, while the *th* of some Aryan languages becomes *f* in others. The Arab is unable to pronounce the letter *p* otherwise than as *b*, and the sounds *b*, *v*, and *m* are little distinguished in any known form of early speech. It is still more remarkable that the *k* of some Aryan dialects becomes *p* in others, as the Latin *quinque* ("five") is the Greek *pente*, or the Latin *columba*, and *palumba*, "dove." The Goidel Kelts also used *k* where the Brythonic Kelts used *p*, and Aryan roots with a guttural first letter have the same meaning as others beginning with *b*. These well-known changes all seem to indicate that early man spoke very indistinctly, and that his ear and tongue were gradually trained to greater delicacy of perception and of expression.

When the original roots came to be combined agglutinative languages were formed, and the roots which were first put together were those which could most easily be pronounced in conjunction. Hence arose in Turanian speech a "vowel harmony," which we find not only in Akkadian but also in modern Turanian tongues, and even a law by which strong consonants appear together, and weak ones together, in words more or less emphatic respectively. Nor is this law confined to Turanian languages, for the "vowel harmony" occurs in Keltic speech, and the modification of consonants in Irish and in ancient Persian. It may also be faintly traced even in Semitic

dialects; but these modifications tend to die out in more advanced languages. Roots were reduplicated, and in all languages the reduplication signified a continued action, or one that was intense and obligatory. Hence the causative is also often denoted by reduplication.

Language when not fixed by literature was subject, as it still is, to very rapid changes. The Bechuana tribes, which are separated from each other by the great distances between the springs and rivers, diverge so quickly in dialect that in a generation or two tribes of one original stock are unable to understand each other. The clipping of words, due to haste and to constant use, has produced all the inflections of modern speech; and even in a slowly changing language like Chinese the grinding down of words goes on, and new monosyllables are thus formed, as any one who has studied the old Cantonese dialect in comparison with the modern Mandarin vocabulary will have observed.[1] Syntax is much more constant than vocabulary, but even syntax is affected by foreign influences. The Chinese adjective now precedes the noun, but in the oldest Turanian speech it followed. Not only did all languages advance from the agglutinative—or "stuck-together"—stage to inflections, which are only decayed agglutinations, or words melted and worn down, but some of the more advanced languages have discarded their old inflexions as useless. This happens when two languages used in one country have very different rules of grammar, as in English, French, Italian, Bulgarian, or Persian. The Hebrew has lost the noun cases, the aorist tense, and several voices of the verb, which can be traced very early in Babylonian. The cause of this advance in Hebrew seems to be

[1] See Chalmers' Cantonese Dictionary, 1878, and Doolittle's Mandarin Dictionary, 1872.

that, for centuries, the race lived in Egypt, where a much simpler language was in use. The decay of words, in other cases, produced confusion, from which the Chinese escape by the tones of utterance which have gradually increased in notation since the days of Confucius. Thus all speech appears to follow the same laws of growth, though with increasing differences of structure and meaning, as new words come into use, and new rules are followed in writing. The finest races are created by the mixture of nations of kindred origin, and the simplest yet most definite languages are the result of such mixture. Gender in nouns arose from old suffixes denoting the female, and in some cases gender is extended to the verb. In the latest stage gender is superseded by new compounds, and new auxiliaries take the place of the forms which are decayed survivals of older ones. The words used by men and by women are naturally often different in many languages.

The great historic races of Asia—Turanian, Semitic and Aryan—sprang from older stocks, and were improved probably by intermixture and by better food. The oldest known Turanian race is the Akkadian, which had its home in Kurdistan and Armenia, where —according to astronomers—it invented the Zodiac. A study of this language shows [1] that it was very like the pure Turkish of Central Asia. The original speakers knew the bear and the wolf, but apparently did not know the lion, which they called the "great dog" (*ur-makh*) when they encountered it later in Chaldea. They seem also to have then named the camel *gam-el* or "humped beast," and the vine *gis-tin* or "tree of life." The study of the early civilisation of Turkish tribes, by Vámbéry, leads to the same

[1] See my paper on Akkadian *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, October 1893, and Vámbéry, "Die Primitive Cultur des Turko-Tatarischen Volkes," 1879.

conclusions as to their cradle in temperate regions, where wild fruits were to be found.

The Semitic languages developed early a very perfect inflectional grammar, whereas the cognate Egyptian remained in a simple condition, distinguishing gender only in nouns, but possessing a causative voice for verbs. The Egyptian was crystallised by the early use of writing, like the Chinese, whereas the Semitic people borrowed the art from the Akkadians somewhat later, after which acquisition their speech developed very slowly. The undivided Semitic ancestors lived in a country where frost and snow were known, and named the bear, which is still found on Mount Hermon, and the lion, of which the bones have been discovered in the gravel beds of the Jordan, and which ranged over Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, being still found even as late as the days of Herodotus in Thrace. They also knew the olive, the fig, and the vine; but it is very doubtful if they knew the ostrich, which roams even as far north as Damascus, or the camel (for which they adopted a Turanian name), which has its home in Central Asia and in Arabia. Nor do they seem to have had a common name for the palm. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that the Semitic stock had its original home in North Syria, or on the Aramean mountains farther east, while neither Africa nor Arabia can be supposed to be represented by the linguistic indications.[1]

The undivided Aryans must have had their cradle farther north, in colder lands. The controversies which raged twenty years ago on this subject seem to have resulted in general consent that this home is to be sought in the Caucasian regions, and on the Volga north of the Caspian.[2] The fauna and flora known to

[1] See Von Kremer, "Semitische Culturenlehnungen," 1875; Hommel, "Die Namen der Säugetiere," 1879.

[2] See O. Schrader, "Prehistoric Antiquities of Aryan Nations," 1890.

the undivided Aryans included the seal, which is found in the Caspian and Black seas, the salmon, which occurs in the Volga, and the beech, which grows as far east as the Caucasus, but which is not found in Central Asia. They were not acquainted with the olive, fig, or vine, or soon forgot the names of such trees, which do not grow in South Russia; nor did they name the ape or the elephant, which would seem, however, to have been very early known to mankind, since their names are the same in Tamil and in Egyptian.[1] The ape was brought by foreigners to Assyria in the ninth century B.C., and then called *udumu*; the elephant had once a much wider range in Asia than it now has, and existed in herds on the Euphrates as late as the sixteenth century B.C. But the Semitic race adopted the Egyptian or the Indian names for both these beasts, and the Europeans called them by words borrowed apparently from Semitic speech.

The general result of such inquiries shows us that the three great historic stocks developed their distinctions of language in cradle lands which were not far apart. A circle with a radius of five hundred miles would cover the whole region,[2] and the centre would be somewhere in Armenia, near the sources of the four great rivers which, according to the Bible, flowed from the "garden of delight," which was the primitive home of man, these rivers being apparently the Araxes and the Pyramus, the Tigris and the Euphrates. Even before the separation of the three races some advance in civilisation had been made, as is shown by simple words common to the three families of speech, and found also in Egyptian. These include a name *(han)* for the dog, taken from its bark, and probably one (*ats*)

[1] *Kapi* for "ape" and *eb* for "elephant."

[2] See my paper on "Comparison of Asiatic Languages," Victoria Institute, 1893.

for the goat. There was a common term for seed and sowing (*se*), which may have been derived from the hissing sound which is to be heard when corn seed is scattered in the furrows. Dress also must have consisted of woven stuff, and was not merely sewn together from skins, though there were tribes west of the Caspian even in the time of Herodotus[1] who were clothed in seal-skins, and ate raw fish; for besides the root *su*, "to join," we have the common root *wab*, "to weave." They not only knew fire but apparently cooked meat, as shown by the word *bak*, and they moulded clay (*tok*), and lived not only in caves (*ub*), but also in some kind of hut (*var*), covered probably by a roof (*dag*) or thatch, while cattle were housed in some enclosure (*kar*), the term being also used for a field. But these early Asiatics knew as yet no metals, and their tools and weapons were still made of wood and stone, or of the sharp horns of deer. The art of drawing, whence the first rude picture signs were derived, from which the various hieroglyphic systems grew, seems to have been also known before the separation of the races; but the later Aryans used the word *skri*, "to scratch," while the Egyptians, Turanians, and Semitic tribes alike used the more primitive term *sor*, which has the same meaning.

The earliest separation seems to have been that between a southern and a northern race. The first offshoot of the former was the tribe which entered Lower Egypt and spoke a language of which Semitic speech may be considered to be a later development. The northern race was Turanian, and its offshoot was the Aryan family, which wandered far north. Turanian speech was arrested by the early use of letters, but the language of the illiterate Aryans developed rapidly into various inflectional dialects. The two

[1] Herodotus, i. 202.

great classes are distinguished especially by syntax, for while in the north such a compound as "cow-herd" is regular and usual (the defining word preceding), in Egyptian and Semitic speech the invariable rule is the reverse, and the compound always stands as "herd-cow." This division into two classes, each of two species, may be due to a yet older division between the small races which preceded the historic stocks thus considered. The evidence of language seems to show that man first appeared in the temperate regions of Western Asia, where a healthy climate, many rivers, wild corn and fruits existed, and where game and fish abounded; and it is from such a centre that we may trace the migrations of man over the whole world.

iv. Race.—The stature of mankind in the average varies between about four and six feet. It does not apparently depend on climate, though the tallest races (in Scotland, Sweden, and Patagonia) are found in cold climates; for the Lapps and the Esquimaux, who represent the shortest of European and American tribes, are also found in the extreme north. The Abyssinians are tall, while the dwarf races of Africa extend from the Congo forests to the foot of the Abyssinian mountains, and appear as Bushmen far south. Food may have more to do than climate with increased stature, and the tall men drove out the dwarfs to worse lands, where they were often obliged to subsist on shell-fish and insects, or on wild roots, until they learned from more advanced races the use of weapons. In the early savage state men fed on dead carcases, and devoured one another. But the teeth and the stomach of man alike show that he was, from the first, neither an exclusively vegetarian nor an entirely flesh-eating animal. A diet of fresh meat, and of grain or pulse, together with a temperate

climate, seems always to have produced the most energetic and powerful races.

Although tall men are found occasionally at an early period, it would seem that the oldest races were as a rule of moderate height, or perhaps even short. Early standards of measurement point to such a conclusion, as do remains of early armour; and the pygmies of Africa[1] were known to the Libyans—apparently on the Upper Niger—in the fifth century B.C., while the Negrito race of Punt (Somali-land), visited by the Egyptians in the sixteenth century B.C., was also of diminutive size.

It is not necessary to suppose that the negro type was that of original man. Even the prognathic jaw, which gives an apelike appearance to the negro skull, and which occurs also among the more savage Mongols of Siberia, does not seem to have been the original type; and blubber lips—among negroes and Mongols—may have developed from exclusive eating of flesh. As regards colour, it is not only indisputable that men are blackest on the equator and fairest in the extreme north—which points to the heat of the sun as the main cause of difference—but (as Darwin has shown in detail) the young of man, like the young of other animals, tend to revert to the colour of the remote ancestor; and while the babes of Europeans are darker, and those of the yellow and red races fairer than the adults, the negro baby is less black, and has blue eyes, with a dusky skin scarcely darker in colour than that of some Aryan infants.[2] The shape of the head also seems to tend to extremes under hard conditions of life, and the hair becomes more curly in hot damp climates, and straighter in cold countries. The difference depends on difference in the cross-section of each hair itself, and it was a very early mark of race:

[1] Herodotus, ii. 32.

[2] Darwin, "Descent of Man," i. p. 318.

Herodotus notices that the dark Indians had straight hair—as they still have[1]—while the Libyans had curly hair, like the negroes represented on the earliest Egyptian slate carvings. But the tendency to extremes may have gradually increased in northern and tropical climes.

It seems probable, therefore, that the earliest human race may have been of small stature and medium measurement of the head, of brown colour with wavy hair; and the ancient Egyptians—though representing an improved stock—seem to come nearest to this description. The division into two families—the northern and the southern—led to the dispersal of a race perhaps about 4 ft. 4 in. high, not only throughout Africa, but also in Southern Asia. It was driven later to the Melanesian islands, where the Negritos still show a similarity of type and speech to the Negrillos of the Dark Continent; and in these hot steamy regions the southern dwarfs perhaps became darker and finally black, and developed the larger and stronger negro races, which drove the pygmies to deserts and forests. The northern race, which was no taller than the southern, spread over Europe and Northern Asia, and was driven yet farther from the centre by the improved Aryo-Turanian stock. It survives among the Lapps, though they have been partially improved, and now average about 4 ft. 11 in. in height. It is found very early (and of less stature) in France and Switzerland, and as far west as Portugal, but never in Britain. The Turkish tribes drove these short Mongolic-featured people eastwards in Siberia, and they still survive in Japan, and among the Esquimaux, who in spite of their long heads are recognisably Turanian in their features.

The Basques of the Biscay provinces, in France and in Spain, are a mixed people. Some are fair and

[1] Herodotus, vii. 70.

long-headed, others dark, short-headed, and more like the Auvergnat type. They speak many dialects of their peculiar language, which is nearest akin to the Finnish. It is agglutinative, and uses suffixes, and has no genders.[1] The numerals are non-Aryan, and several of them are very close to those of the Akkadians. The words for "dog" (*or*) and "copper" (*uraida*) are also the same as in the Akkadian; and out of a hundred Basque words for the commonest objects and actions two-thirds are to be found in Finnish and other Turanian languages, and of these about half are known in Akkadian, which is the oldest language of the Turanian family. These words include names for "boat," "bow," "arrow," "God," "ox," "goat," "cow," and "horse"; for "fire" and "copper," "tribe," "father," "mother," "brother," and "son," with personal pronouns. The original Basques appear to have been herdsmen, and may have known the horse as a wild animal; for in the Neolithic age the ponies which roamed over Europe were extensively hunted, and eaten by early savages. Though the name for "copper" is original, those for other metals are borrowed from Latin; and out of the hundred words eighteen at least have been so borrowed from Keltic, Latin, French, and Italian. These "culture terms" include words for "house," "tower," "pot," "pig," "ass," "lion," "cheese," "gold," "silver," and "bronze," and they show clearly that the later civilisation of the race was due to admixture with the Keltic and Latin elements in French and Spanish lands.

It has been supposed that the Iberians,[2] who mingled with the Kelts in Spain, were of this non-Aryan race which never reached Britain. The Basques have retained the strange custom of the *couvade*, or "hatch-

[1] See W. J. Van Eys, "The Basque Language," 1883.

[2] See Diodorus V. ii., and for Corsica V. i.

ing," which obliges the father to nurse the baby in bed for some days after its birth. Diodorus mentions this custom in Corsica, and Strabo among the Tibareni of Asia Minor. It appears to be a distinctively Turanian custom, noticed by Marco Polo in China, and known in Japan, Greenland, and California, as also among the Dravidians in India.

As regards the Iberians various rather vague theories exist. There were Iberians in Asia Minor, whom Josephus connects with the Turanian tribe of Tubal often mentioned in Assyrian texts.[1] The Greeks called Spain "Iberia," and Tacitus says that it was believed that Iberians from Spain were repulsed by the Silures in Cornwall. Some scholars see such a Spanish element also in Ireland, where, however, it may be due to the Spanish colonies of the time of the Tudors. The term Iberian (used of the Georgians in the middle ages) seems to be Aryan, and to mean nothing more than "Westerns." It cannot be truly used as a racial name. Broca unfortunately saw a resemblance between the Cromagnon skulls and those of the Guanchos in the Canary Islands; but more accurate observations have shown that these types differ, and especially so in the form of the nose. The Guanchos were a Berber people, speaking a language which is connected by grammar and vocabulary with Egyptian. In the fifteenth century the Spaniards found them still making mummies, which they called by the old name (*kha*) used in Egypt.[2] It may be confidently said that neither the Berber type nor the Berber language, which is so peculiar in its grammar and vocabulary, has ever been found to have spread

[1] Josephus, "Antiq.," I. vi. 1. Tacitus ("Agricola," 11), says: "Silurum colorati vultus torti plerumque crines, et posita contra Hispania, Iberos veteres trajecisse, easque sedes occupasse, fidem faciunt."

[2] See my paper on "The Canary Islanders," *Scottish Review*, April 1892.

to ancient Europe. The Portuguese, the Maltese, and perhaps the Neapolitans, present a type which suggests the admixture of Berber blood; but this is not represented in any early statues, and is no doubt due to the invasion of Spain, and of the Mediterranean islands, by the mixed Arabs and Berbers of Africa after the triumph of Islam in Egypt. The theory of a "Mediterranean race," based on the mistake of Broca and on the modern mixed Portuguese type, has been further developed into the supposition that this race should be called Iberian, and that it spread to Britain. But this cannot be reconciled with the idea that the Basques were Iberians; and there is no evidence at all that any Berber, or that any Turanian race, ever entered the British Isles. The term Iberian leads to nothing but confusion.

The African languages are very difficult to trace, on account of the rapid changes of speech among savages, and because of later Aryan and Semitic admixture; but there can be no doubt that Champollion was right in connecting the Libyan or Berber languages of the north coast of Africa with the ancient Egyptian; and many widely spread and simple words —especially those for fire—seem to connect the Nubian and the Bantu dialects with the same ancient language of the north-east. In Libya there were successive invasions by early Greeks, and later Romans and Vandals (which account for the fair complexion and blue eyes still found among Berbers), as well as Semitic invasions by Phœnicians and Arabs. The Abyssinian type, which often presents aquiline features with coal-black colour, is due to the presence of the *Habash* or "mixed" population springing from the intrusion of Sabean Arabs, which we trace by inscriptions back to the third century B.C. At the present time the Arabs from the east and from the north have penetrated over nearly the whole of

the dark Continent, and have profoundly affected the type and the language of Negro and Bantu races. But the earlier Egyptian influence is traceable not only in the Nile valley but yet farther south. The Zulu wooden pillow is exactly like that used in ancient Egypt, and the Bushmen not only possess a power of drawing and painting which may be thought to be a survival of Egyptian art, but also a peculiar physical conformation (the "tablier Égyptien," or "Hottentot apron"),[1] which may also connect them with the old race of the Nile delta.[2] The Bantu traditions all point to the north-east as the home of ancestral tribes, but even as early as the time of the first dynasty we have representations of Negrillos, as attacked by Asiatic conquerors resembling in type the Cappadocians, and bearing the double axe, which was a distinctive weapon of the early Turanians of Asia Minor, and is not found in use among later Egyptians. The head of the earlier Egyptian race is also thought, by Virchow, to have been rounder than that of the mummies belonging to the fifth dynasty. The racial history of Africa seems therefore to be that of an originally diminutive stock, spreading from the Nile and developing into the stronger Nubian negro. They were followed by Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan conquerors, who drove them to the south.

In this history the Hottentots, however (in South Africa), present a peculiar problem. They are in many respects akin to the Bushmen, but their slanting eyes and high cheek-bones give them so Mongolic an appearance that the Dutch called them "Chinamen." After personal study of Koranna tribes and Bushmen,

[1] The formation is very rare except in tropical regions, being due to the presence in the blood of the *Filaria* (a parasite of the mosquito) which is found in stagnant water.

[2] C. Bertin, "The Bushmen and their Language," *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, XVIII. i.

I was led to the conclusion that the Hottentots represent a mixed race in which a Malay element must be recognised. The Hovas of Madagascar are acknowledged to present such an admixture, on account not only of type, but also because their language is Malay, as is especially shown by the numerals. The Hovas, however, have some resemblance to the Siamese, who represent the admixture of Malays and Hindus; and some of their words (such as *Rana*, "queen") are Hindu and not Malay. In the middle ages the Malays—after the appearance of the Hindus among them—were bold sailors who visited the islands of the Melanesian archipelago; and their appearance in Madagascar probably dates from this later period. There is still a large Malay population of Moslems in Cape Town, and there is no reason why the mediæval Malays should not also have settled as traders on the South African shores. We are thus able to explain the existence among Hottentots and Bushmen of myths and fables which suggest an Asiatic connection. Some of the fables may be African, and the negroes deported to America preserve similar stories; but the legends which refer to the Magellan clouds, and the star Arcturus, were more probably taken from the Malays.

The Turanians were the first civilisers of Western Asia and perhaps of Egypt as well. There is a recognisable connection between their earliest hieroglyphics and those of Egypt, but the two systems must have separated at a very early period when little more than "picture writing" existed, and they developed independently in accord with the necessities of languages of very different structure and of distinct vocabularies. The Turanian type in Chaldea resembles that of the Tartars rather than that of the Eastern Mongols, presenting a round head with a receding forehead and a hairless face. The nose is sometimes

aquiline (as among Tartars), sometimes thick and straight as among Turks, and the jaw is powerful and determined. The lamb's-wool cap now worn by Turkoman tribes is represented at Tell Loh, in Chaldea, as early as 2800 B.C. The Hittites, as known from their own monuments and by coloured Egyptian pictures from the sixteenth to the thirteenth centuries B.C., present the same Tartar type, being yellowish in complexion, with black hair. They wear the Tartar pigtail which the Manchus of our seventeenth century imposed on the Chinese, and the conical headdress which the Turks were still wearing in the eighteenth century A.D., as well as the curled slipper still worn in the East, both of which also distinguish the Etruscans in Italy. The Turanian race spread early from its Armenian home to the mouth of the Euphrates, and on the west it is traced by monuments of most archaic character to the shores of Ionia. It also spread early through Syria to Egypt. A Hittite seal of the sixteenth century B.C. has been found at Lachish in Philistia, and after the Hyksos period in Egypt we not only find pottery marked with the later forms of the Hittite hieroglyphics, but the Egyptian language presents many words which seem to be borrowed from the Akkadian, including terms for "father," "chief," "judge," "month," and others.[1] In the same age the Egyptians also borrowed Semitic terms for "iron" and "gold," "horse" and "chariot," "chief," "lord," "noble," "officer," "well," "town," "vineyard," "oil," "honey," "tamarisk," "acacia," "cypress," "pillar," and "wall," with the name of the camel, which may have been taken from the Syrians though originally Turanian. The invasion of Egypt by the mixed Turanian and Semitic population of Babylonia and Canaan, beginning about 2200 B.C., is

[1] *Ab*, "month," *aba*, "judge," *ata*, "chief," *nir*, "chief," *ai*, "father," for instance. There appear to be about a hundred such words in all.

thus attested by the recovery of words which do not belong to the original Egyptian language, but which represent a borrowed culture.

The Turanians, though finally subdued by the Assyrians and Persians, were never exterminated. There were Hittite chiefs in Syria as late as 600 B.C., and the Kati of Cappadocia—who spoke a Hittite dialect—seem even to have been ruled by a Turanian chief (Tarkondemos) in the time of Pompey. In Armenia itself the Turanian Minni were exterminated later by the Medes and Assyrians, but were powerful in the sixteenth century B.C., and spoke a tongue akin to Hittite and Akkadian: farther east we find that similar dialects were still spoken about 500 B.C. by the inhabitants of Susa, east of the Tigris, and two hundred miles farther north at Behistán, in southern Media, forming a third element of population, according to the cuneiform texts, with the Assyrian and the Persian.

The Lydians, who, according to Herodotus,[1] sailed to Italy about 1000 B.C., were probably of this same Turanian stock, as we learn from the sarcophagi, statues, tomb frescoes, and inscriptions of Etruria. Dionysius[2] states that the Etruscan language was unlike any other. Rawlinson and Sir C. T. Newton regard the type as Turanian,[3] and Isaac Taylor shows that the eight Etruscan numerals, on the Toscanella dice, are like the Turanian numerals, as are all the known Etruscan words, and as the agglutinative character of their grammar also indicates. The question has been complicated by the assumption that certain long texts—such as the Eugubian tablets[4]

[1] Herodotus, i. 94.

[2] Dionysius, i. 30.

[3] Rawlinson's "Herodotus," i. p. 702; Dennis, "Etruria," i. p. 281; Isaac Taylor, "Etruscan Researches," 1874, "The Etruscan Language," 1876.

[4] Sir W. Betham, "Etruria Celtica," 1842, i. p. 89.

—are Etruscan, whereas they appear to be really Keltic, or akin to Latin, as are also the Oscan bronze tablets. But the Etruscan alphabet differs from that of the Umbrians and Oscans, and the short funerary texts of Etruscan tombs are apparently non-Aryan. The race presents the well-known Mongolic type, with yellow face, black hair, and slanting eyes. The lady whose coloured statue is found on the great pottery sarcophagus from Cære might be taken to represent a Chinese woman. The first Etruscans from Lydia were highly civilised. Their costume was like that of Hittites, and they used the double axe which was used by Hittites, Lycians, and Cretans. The sexual immorality of the Lydians also characterised the Etruscans, and they brought with them an early Asiatic alphabet, and used polygonal masonry such as is found in various parts of Asia Minor, as well as pottery of the same derivation. Their symbols included the swastica and the sphinx, both of which were known to the Hittites; and the presence of a Turanian population in Lydia is shown by the recovery of Hittite seal cylinders and bas-reliefs. The Etruscan title Tarkon (found in their texts) is the Hittite Tarkhan—a word still used in Turkish for a "tribal chief."

As regards the Etruscan language itself, the commonest words in funerary texts are clearly Turanian,[1] and so are other words mentioned by Latin authors,[2] as well as the names of the gods. The Roman race sprang from an admixture of Etruscan and Latin blood; and the Roman skull, which has remained almost unchanged to the present day, was shorter and rounder than that of the purely Aryan Greeks.

[1] Such as *klan*, "son," *sech*, "child," *puia*, "child," *avil*, "life," *leine*, "he lived," *aul*, "son," *kulmo*, "grave," and the suffix *na*, "of."

[2] *Ausel*, "dawn," *carex*, "reed," *agalletora*, "small boy," *damnus*, "horse," *atr*, "day," *itus*, "month," *fala*, "hill," *toria*, "sky," *Ais*, "God.'

The great characteristic of the Turanian races is their stolid determination or slow courage, which made them for more than a thousand years the masters of other races in Western Asia, and which still distinguishes the dogged Turk and the Chinese Mongol. An infusion of Turanian blood into the veins of Keltic and Teutonic Aryans has thus produced some of the strongest ruling races of the West. The Etruscans were "masters of the sea" (according to Diodorus) in early times, and so persistent was their influence that the "folletti" of Tuscan mythology still preserve the names and characters, not of Latin, but of Etruscan gods. The race presented a distinct character among the Greek, Keltic, Latin, and Teutonic tribes of Italy, long after the conquest of all other peoples by the mixed Roman stock.

But the Turanian populations of Europe are now scattered remnants of the original races. The Lapps appear to have been driven far north by the early Aryans. The Finns and Esthonians have been extensively Aryanised, and are now often fair, tall, and blue-eyed, though their language—which is full of Aryan culture terms—preserves its ancient grammar, and is recognisably connected with the Akkadian. The Hungarian represents the later admixture of Finns with the Mongol Huns of the fifth century A.D. The Basques are (as we have seen) an isolated tribe of Finnic origin. The remaining tribes in the south-east of Russia include Tartars, whose invasion dates only from the thirteenth century of our era. It is in Asia that the chief spread of the Turanians from Media has occurred, and the Bactrian Turks are nearest in type and speech to the original Akkadians. It is not impossible that the Khitai, who dominated Central Asia in the ninth century A.D., and who spoke a Turko-Mongol dialect, may be connected by name with the ancient Kheta or Hittites of North Syria,

who were deported to the east by the Assyrians. The word itself is Mongolic, and appears to signify "allies" or "relatives." The Chinese are still called Khitai by Mongols and Russians, and the mediæval Cathay is a term derived from this tribal name.

The Turanians of Bactria separated as they went east into two main families, the Mongols on the north and the Himalayans on the south. The Chinese tribes were Mongol, and the Chinese language is still recognisably connected with the Mongolic, of which the Buriat dialect is said to be the oldest. But the Mongol language, spoken over so large an area of Northern Asia, is closely connected with Turkish.[1] The Kols and the Dravidians are Turanians who entered India from the north and north-west, and who remain still in a very savage state except where civilised by the Aryan Hindus. They mingled with the original Negrito stock, whom they drove southwards, and who are still represented by forest dwarfs and by the Veddahs of Ceylon. According to Huxley even the degraded Australians, who represent one of the lowest human types, are connected racially with this mixed Negrito-Dravidian stock. The Turanians also advanced south through Burma to the Malay peninsula, mingling no doubt with earlier small races, and presenting a less powerful type than that of the Mongols. Some of the southern Chinese present this Malay type, while the tall and powerful peasant of North China is more purely Mongol.

The Malay influence in Polynesia probably did not begin to be felt till our middle ages, but is notable in many myths and customs. The head-hunting of the Maoris recalls that of the Malays, and their Levirate custom (or marriage to a brother's widow) has apparently the same origin, as also their rude astronomy.

[1] See Castrén, "Burjätischen Sprachlehre," 1857, and Böhtlingk, "Die Sprache der Jakuten," 1851.

Not only in New Zealand and in Australia, which were peopled from the North, do we find stories of the lost Pleiad, the belt of Orion, and the Milky Way, which seem to be clearly Asiatic, but even the Papuan Negritos present crosses with the Malay, and took the use of jade and of the blowpipe (or air-gun) from this more civilised Turanian stock. The fine brown Polynesian type appears to have been due to admixture of Malay and Negrito races. The Polynesian and Australian numerals are alike of Malay origin. As regards language generally, more than fifty simple words may be cited which are recognisably the same in Malay, Polynesian, and Australian speech. These include not only pronouns and verbs, but words for "stone," "house," "boat," "pig," "fish," "snake," "milk," "egg," "bow," "axe," "brother," "son," "fire," "sun," "moon," "star," and "sea": indicating the diffusion of these races (in a very primitive condition of civilisation) by canoes which passed from island to island. The Polynesians were venturesome mariners, and the New Zealand Maoris have been known to undertake voyages of fifteen hundred miles in their canoes.

In North-Eastern Asia there appears to have been an early long-headed type, still to be found among the Chinese, the Ainos, and some Japanese, but which was either Turanian or mixed with the Mongolic stock. From this race the long-headed Esquimaux and the American Indian appear to be derived. In spite of the difference in head measurement, the Esquimaux type is so clearly Mongolic that Sir William Flower pronounces them to be "a branch of the typical North Asiatic Mongols": they are compared by Baron Nordenskiöld with the Chukchis and Koryaks of Siberia, though these tribes are short-headed. The Esquimaux still pass backwards and forwards between America and Asia in their canoes.

Their language also, in grammar and in vocabulary, compares with the Mongolic.

Since the time of Humboldt it has been recognised that the American Indians, though long-headed, are in type similar to the Tartar race. The faces of the Hittites on the monuments are often very like those of Red Indians, and customs such as the *couvade* (in California and in South America) indicate a Turanian connection, as do beliefs in the heavenly bridge, the four ages of the world, the flood story, and that of the virgin mother. America is practically occupied by a single native race coming from high latitudes in the north,[1] and the American languages (excepting perhaps the Chinese-like Otomi) present the same structure throughout. These languages are described as "incorporating," because of their use of long compounds, and some scholars suppose that they are thus to be distinguished from Turanian languages. But the Mongolian shows a very similar "incorporating" structure, and such compounds are not unknown even in Teutonic speech. A comparative study of American dialects shows that the words for simple objects, and actions, are the same in the north, the central, and the south regions of America; and it shows also very clearly that these words are to be found in Mongol speech. The North American numerals present striking parallels with those of Ugric speech, and the Quichuan in South America are also like the Turanian. About a hundred and forty simple monosyllables, common to many American languages, are closely similar to Mongolic roots; and some of these words are of great interest as indicating the derivation of the Red Indian stock: they include terms for "boat" (*kayak*), "axe" (*taka*), "knife" (*kiai*), "arrow" (*aka*), "fish" (*kan*), "dog" (*ku*), "bear" (*mat* or *mar*), "snow" (*tek*), "fire" (*taik*), and "the sea" (*vat*),

[1] See Brinton's "Myths of the New World," 1876, p. 35.

which are all very old Turanian words, and the pronouns and suffixes belong to the same class. We may probably conclude that the first migrants into America came over in boats, and brought dogs for hunting, but did not bring any cattle. They knew the bear, and were familiar with snow and ice: their word for the sea was distinctively Asiatic. They were hunters who as yet used no metals, and their ideas of writing did not extend beyond the simplest picture records. The sporadic civilisations of Mexico and Peru were apparently of much later Asiatic derivation—as will be noted subsequently—but by crossing the narrow Behring Straits the Siberians were able to reach the New World, over which they spread at some unknown early period.

From the preceding sketch of various migrations it will be seen that the whole earth could be populated from the Asiatic centre without crossing any great stretch of ocean. But if we could have seen the world five thousand years ago, when the populations were very small and separated by considerable distances, we should perhaps have found that the continents and islands far from the first cradle of his birth were as yet unreached by man. Such seems to be the natural deduction from the absence of fossil remains in America and Africa, while the Polynesian islands were perhaps reached in boats at quite a late date. Even the Americans, before they left Asia, had some ideas of gods and of the family, and used Turanian words for "deity," "father," "mother," and "son": they used pottery, and not impossibly knew of corn (perhaps wild), and hunted (or domesticated) pigs as well as deer. They had original words even for some kind of hut or tent.

The extension of the Semitic race was chiefly to the south and the west—to Arabia, Egypt, and Africa, and among the Mediterranean islands, as well as to the

south shores of Asia Minor. The Babylonians appear somewhat suddenly on the scene, about 2200 B.C., as traders, mingling with an Akkadian population under Turanian rulers, and adopting Akkadian letters and civilisation. They existed quite as early in Nineveh and in Palestine, and migrated to Cappadocia and to Egypt. Semitic traders also had fleets on the Mediterranean as early as 1500 B.C., and the Phœnicians spread to the Greek islands and to Greece itself. After the foundation of Carthage (about 850 B.C.) they sailed yet farther west, and settled at Marseilles and at Cadiz in Spain, but we have no indication of their presence in the far north, or in the British Isles.[1]

There is not only no evidence that the Semitic home is to be sought in Arabia, but the evidence of languages excludes this supposition. The East Arab dialects—according to inscriptions—were more like the Assyrian, while the West Arab dialects are nearer to the Aramaic. The Sabean presents many ancient words and forms, but is substantially Aramean, and it appears clear that Arabia was colonised by two Semitic families along its eastern and western coasts. Our first acquaintance with Arabia is due to the inscriptions and bas-reliefs of Tiglath-pileser, who invaded the Nabatheans in 734 B.C. They were then nomads, riding on camels. None of the inscriptions of Arabia appear to be older than about 500 B.C., and the antiquity of some texts has been greatly overrated.

[1] The Semitic languages gradually separated into two families—the *Aramaic* of Syria and the *Babylonian* of Mesopotamia. To the former class belong the Palmyrene and Syriac dialects, the Nabathean of North-West Arabia, and the Hebrew, which (as already noted) was modified by contact with Egyptian. Our earliest monumental knowledge of pure Hebrew is based on the Siloam text of about 728 B.C. The Moabite of 900 B.C. was a dialect presenting affinities to the early Aramaic found at Samala about 800 B.C., and it differed, especially in its Aramaic masculine plural, from Hebrew. The Phœnician belongs to the same class.

We practically know nothing about Arabia before the Assyrian conquest, but the Arabs of Hadramaut adored Assyrian gods (such as Istar, Sin, and Nebo), and built a stepped pyramid at Ghumdān like those of Babylonia. The Sabean alphabet may have been derived (perhaps as early as 1000 B.C.) from the Phœnician, or from the Greek (about 600 B.C.), but the extant texts date only from about 300 B.C. at earliest. These Sabeans invaded Abyssinia, and ruled Yemen down to the time of Justinian, or later. There is reason to suppose that they had reached the mouths of the Zambesi as early as the second century A.D.,[1] but the ruined *Zimbabwes* (or "stone walls") of Mashonaland, which represent the fortresses of gold miners, thought to have been early pagan Arabs, have so far given no indications of early date, the clearly foreign remains consisting of Chinese porcelain of the seventeenth century A.D. The Arabs became great sailors, reaching India and China, but even in the greatest age of Islam they did not penetrate as conquerors into the far East. The Semitic traders, on the other hand, in the fifteenth century B.C., communicated by sea with Egypt, and the Babylonian language was then spoken and written, not only in Syria but in Elishah, somewhere on the coasts of Asia Minor. The Punic alphabet spread to Spain; and the Numidian inscriptions (of which about two hundred are known belonging to the Roman age) are written in a script clearly connected with the Sabean. It would seem, therefore, that as early as the time of the Ptolemies the Arabs may have followed the Phœnicians along the north shores of Africa. The dispersion of the Jews led to their appearance in South Russia after the Christian era, and they became numerous and powerful in Persia and in Bactria, penetrating far south in India. They also, yet earlier, appeared in Abyssinia as

[1] H. E. O'Neill, Scottish Geographical Society, February 1886.

Falashas or "emigrants"; and, as they spread over Europe and Asia, they mingled at times with other races, so that we find fair blue-eyed Jews in Poland, and black Jews in India and in Africa, while those of Morocco and Spain also approximate to native types. The Afghans of the higher classes are often very Semitic in appearance, resembling the ancient Assyrians. There may be some late Jewish admixture in this case, but the type is more probably Aramaic, and due both to the Assyrian influence and to the Moslem invasion. The Persian language became full of Aramaic words (in the Pehlevi dialect), and is now full of Arabic nouns, though its main stock is Aryan. In like manner the Bactrians were mainly of mixed Turano-Aryan race, but may early have included a Semitic element of population. The Semitic centre is in Western Asia, and their main outlet has always been found from the earliest ages in Africa.

The extension of the early Aryans from the Volga was mainly through South Russia, though the Aryan Medes had reached the Assyrian borders as early as 850 B.C., while the Persians about the same time appeared to the south-east. The history of the Iranian extension to India belongs to historic times. The Scythians of Herodotus were a mixed people,[1] some of them being flat-nosed, and apparently Turanian. They spoke seven dialects, and all the known Scythian words appear to be Aryan.[2] The word itself seems to mean a "horde" (*Scath*), and reappears far west among the North-Irish Scots. The Scythian name for the earth (*apia*) is found in the Georgian *obi*, as well as in the Latin *ops*. The Georgian[3] is only known to us through religious writings of the middle ages, and appears to have

[1] Herodotus, iv. 23, 24.

[2] Rawlinson's "Herodotus," iii. p. 190.

[3] Brosset, "Éléments de la Langue Géorgienne," 1837, p. v.

absorbed Armenian and Iranian words; but, as the Aryan noun-cases (both in singular and plural) appear in Georgian, we are perhaps justified in regarding it as the survival of a Scythian dialect.

Among the oldest migrants to the West appear to have been the Thracians, who preserved the custom of burning the dead and that of *Sati*, or self-sacrifice of the widow, both of which are distinctively Aryan.[1] They dwelt in the lake villages of Lake Prasias, and penetrated later into north-western Asia Minor as Phrygians, from whom the Armenians were descended.[2] Modern Armenian is a fairly pure Aryan language, with some admixture of Turkish and Arabic words. A comparison with Armenian of about a dozen words found on Phrygian texts indicates a connection; and the Phrygian words mentioned by classic writers appear to be all Aryan, while Plato held that this language was akin to Greek, and Strabo and Pliny that the Phrygians came from Thrace.[3] Although the Phrygian texts are still unread, and only number about a dozen in all, it is clear that the language is Aryan, and presents some distant resemblance also to Greek. The Lycian language of the fifth century B.C. is, on the other hand, Iranian, and represents the spread of the Medic tongue (which is first found in Vannic texts) to the Lycian shores after their conquest by Harpagus, the general of Cyrus.[4]

The earliest inhabitants of Greece and Italy were called Pelasgi by the Hellenes, but the word may mean nothing more than "neighbours" or "inhabitants." We know practically nothing about these

[1] Herodotus, v. 4, 5, 8, 16.

[2] *Idem*, ii. 2, vii. 73.

[3] Strabo, X. iii. 16; Pliny, "H. N.," v. 41; Plato, "Cratylus." The known words include *bekos*, "bread," *kimeros*, "chamber," *bagaios*, "god" (as among Slavs and Iranians), *balin*, "king," and *glouros*, "gold."

[4] See my paper on the Lycian, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, October 1891.

Pelasgi except that they did not apparently speak Greek; but the island of Lemnos is said to have long preserved a Pelasgic population.[1] An ancient inscribed bas-relief was discovered in Lemnos by MM. Cousin and Durbach, the alphabet being of the oldest Greek type. The spearman represented has Aryan features: the accompanying texts, though as yet unread, seem to be clearly in an Aryan dialect: they possibly mention the neighbouring regions of Phocæa and Æolia in Asia Minor, and they may perhaps represent a "Pelasgic" dialect which was not unlike the Phrygian. The pictures found at Knossos in Crete (accompanying ancient texts which seem probably to be written in Greek) represent a long-headed type with black hair, and such a type is still very common in Greece and in the Levant. It is clearly Aryan, but very different from that of the Hellenes or "bright" people, who had blue eyes and red or golden hair—this type also surviving, it is said, among Greek peasants. The typical Aryan (still represented by the Ossetes of the Caucasus) had red hair and blue or hazel eyes, and the oldest known statue at Athens has the hair coloured red. But a pale-faced people, with blue or dark eyes and black hair, appears to have spread along the north shores of the Mediterranean in early times, and either mixed with the Neolithic race already described (which was of medium stature with a long head and somewhat feeble physical powers), or else was identical with that race which is represented in the English "long barrows." The older Keltic swarm, speaking the Goidel dialects (Gaelic and Irish), presents the dark-haired type, with a pale complexion and blue or brown eyes. It is to be found in North Wales and in the Hebrides, while in Ireland it is characteristic of the Irish-speaking peasantry, especially in

[1] Herodotus, v. 26, vi. 138.

the Connemara mountains west of Loch Mask. This Goidel race was followed by the red-haired Kelts, who speak Brythonic dialects and who are found in Bretagne, Cornwall, Devon, and South Wales. They appear to have burned the dead, and have left tumuli with cists for the ashes. The two types may represent the *Dubh-Gael* ("black strangers") and the *Fionn-Gael* ("fair strangers") of Irish tradition, and the red-haired Kelt is still to be found in Clare and Limerick. But Irish populations are now quite as mixed as those of Great Britain, presenting Danish, Norman, and Teutonic types, with later Dutch and Walloon settlers, and perhaps some Spanish blood in the south.

The Kelts, as known to Herodotus and Diodorus,[1] followed the southern banks of the Danube and spread over France and into Spain, mingling in the far West with the Basques. The Keltic dialects present many very archaic features of speech, but are nearest to the Latin languages and the Greek. The fair or ruddy type probably followed the "Pelasgi" into Greece, and passed into Italy either from the north or across the Adriatic from the Illyrian shores. The Oscans, Latini, and Sabini, would seem to have been offshoots of the original Kelto-Latin stock; but Italy was always subject to the inroads of the short-headed Teutons on the north, while in the south and east there was a large Greek population, which survived till the sixth century A.D., and which, indeed, is still traceable among the beautiful mountain peasantry of Apulia.

The undivided Aryans possessed the rudiments of civilisation either before they separated from the Turanians, or in consequence of later borrowings from Asiatic civilisation. They are believed to have travelled in two-wheeled ox-waggons,[2] such as are

[1] Herodotus, iv. 49; Diodorus, V. ii. [2] Herodotus, iv. 121.

represented on Thracian coins; and such ox-carts, with solid wooden wheels, are still to be seen in the south of Italy and in Spain. But the Aryans never developed any higher culture of their own before the Greeks came in contact (perhaps as early as 1500 B.C.) with the civilised Turanian and Semitic inhabitants of Asia Minor, from whom they took their alphabets and syllabaries, weights and measures, and many figures of their mythology, as well as words for metals and for foreign articles of trade. The Slavs and the Teutons, who penetrated into Central Europe from Russia, mingled with the Finnic populations. The German "row graves" are held to represent a long-headed type of rulers among a short-headed population, but gradually the general type became distinctively short-headed, especially among the South Germans and the Swiss. In the far north the Aryans mixed with the old flat-headed race of Scandinavia, and produced the fine Norse type, also recognisable among Frisians and in the neighbourhood of the Zuider Zee according to Virchow. The Normans were tall, with fair or brown hair, representing the mixture of this Scandinavian stock with the Franks who were Teutonic, and with the Kelts of France. These mixed Aryan types represent some of the most powerful of historic races in Europe. No very great lapse of time is required to account for the divergence of European dialects, considering that the tribes were probably small and entirely illiterate, separated by great distances from each other, and separating to conquer the aborigines by superior strength and better weapons. Their dispersion may have begun not earlier than about 2000 B.C., and their separation from the Asiatics a thousand years earlier.

The older populations, represented by skulls from dolmen tombs, seem to have belonged to all these

types—Pelasgic or Keltic, Teutonic and Scandinavian; and it is impossible to suppose that all rude stone monuments in Europe and in Asia were the work of one age or of one race. Stones were piled up for various purposes—for altars, or in circles, for monuments, or to form tribal cemeteries as in Guernsey. In Palestine (as shown by the excavations at Gezer and at Gath) such monumental stones and altars were erected by Canaanites (who were probably Semitic) about 2000 B.C. The Arabs erected dolmens, and still do so. The hill-sides east of Jordan are covered with them. They are also still erected in connection with menhirs and sacred circles by Dravidians in India. They were set up by some early race in North Africa. In Europe they are often of Keltic origin, but sometimes Scandinavian and Danish in Scotland and Ireland. They have been found to contain Roman coins of the fourth century A.D.[1]

By thus tracing the migrations of man, we are able to see that the great purpose was the same which—working through long ages—had prepared the horse and the elephant for his use. The separate tribes developed peculiarities useful for the general advance of culture. They produced more vigorous mixed races when nations in the same stage of civilisation, and not too distantly related, mingled together. The seriousness of the Mongol, the imagination of the Kelt, and the energy of the Semitic race, contributed alike to the formation of ruling races in Europe and Asia. Even the lower and more primitive peoples, driven

[1] Fergusson, "Rude Stone Monuments," 1872, p. 11. The attempt to prove a remote date for Stonehenge by astronomical arguments connected with the exact bearing of the "Friar's Heel" or pointer stone outside the circle, is vitiated by the evident fact that the stone has settled on its foundations, and is no longer quite vertical. It supposes also an exactitude of observation among ancient Druids which is contrary to all that we know of the rude orientation of early Babylonian and Egyptian buildings.

from the centre, were forced in time to adopt the culture of their conquerors, and were improved by a new strain of the foreign blood of the victors. Had man been able to live in a soft climate, and to subsist on bananas and game, he would never have been trained by hardship and want in the inventions which necessity produced, and would have remained in his original savage condition. New thought was created when ancient civilisation was regarded with fresh eyes by new races, who adopted the culture of neighbours, and who learned from foreign traders the arts of their homes. The strongest stocks, speaking languages full of foreign words, were produced by mixture. The old languages died out when the old stock was absorbed, and new languages of greater power and simplicity grew out of the dialects spoken by those elements which combined to form the new nation. Substantially, since the beginning of history proper, the tongues which then distinguished the three Asiatic races have prevailed in the same regions where they are first found; but in no part of the world is it possible to find either a pure race or a pure language; nor do we find such even at the dawn of history. Causes beyond human control—climatic and geographical—drove the increasing hordes to further lands, as pressure of population increased. Indolence, and love of the familiar, would otherwise have prevented the discovery of new and fairer regions.

Although pride of race has often made the nobler stocks unwilling to mix with strangers, whom they regarded as their inferiors, the admiration of strange beauty lured the hearts not only of the Hebrews but of many other conquering peoples. Woman was regarded by savages as a slave, and when the men of a conquered tribe were slain the girls were saved as spoil. Raids were indeed often undertaken in order to win wives; and though many customs thought to

symbolise an ancient "marriage by capture" are better explained, in later ages, by ideas of reluctance and modesty—especially among Semitic peoples—yet it is clear that there was a general tendency to prefer wives of another tribe; which may perhaps have been due to early observation of the dangers of in-breeding. The family was older than the tribe; and natural jealousy must from the first have fostered the exclusive conjugal tie; for the names for "brother" and "son" go back to the earliest ages. In days of constant war, when men were slain and women captured, polygamy was a natural result, and appears to have been the general condition. New colonies formed by young unmarried men (as among the Zulus) were reduced either to capture wives, or (when that was impossible) in some cases to polyandry, the wife being recognised (as among the Indian hill tribes or in ancient Arabia) as having several husbands—generally related to one another. The belief that a man who had no son to care for his corpse haunted the tribe as a ghost, originated the Levirate custom—that of marrying the brother's widow—the first son being regarded as that of the dead husband. This we find early among the Hebrews, but the custom is widely spread among the southern races, and is known in Polynesia and in South Africa alike.

It must, however, be admitted that among savage tribes the marriage tie has always been very easily dissolved; and at seasons of public rejoicing it was —and still is—quite disregarded. The orgies of the Australians and Polynesians, and those of the Bantu tribes, though sanctioned by religious customs, represent the survival of savage licence, such as was permitted at the Bacchanalia, or characterises the Sakti worshippers of India. Men, if believed to be of divine origin, have also been granted special privileges (as in India or among the Moslems), on account

of the anxiety of the tribe to possess as many divine children as possible. The Australian orgies are connected with rites of initiation of the young which were also common, and which are traced among Aryans as well as in Africa, the initiation being extended to grown girls as well as grown boys. Circumcision rites were naturally connected with this initiation; and, although the Hebrews circumcised infants, the older rule (as among Arabs and Australians or Zulus) appears to have been to perform the rite on boys about thirteen years of age or more. This strange custom appears to distinguish the original southern race. It prevailed in Egypt, and among the Colchians, who were said to be Egyptian colonists, as well as among Phœnicians, Arabs, Copts, or Zulus and other Bantus. In Africa it may sometimes have been imposed by Moslems on their converts, but this does not apply to the Australians, who never came under Moslem influence. Among the northern races circumcision was apparently never practised.

Temporary marriages and other abnormal conditions also mark the early savage state. The former prevailed among Aryans in Persia, and among early Arabs. The marriage of a slave or captive was less honourable than that of a free woman, and the son of the concubine took rank below that of the dowered wife, though he was not a slave, nor could his mother be sold as such. The dower was a fund held in trust by the father of a free woman, as a provision against desertion or caprice on the part of the bridegroom who paid it. No nation which preserves this arrangement (which we trace early among Babylonians and Hebrews) regards it as a selling of the bride; and even among those who most insist on the parental right to arrange marriages, some consent on the part of the girl has always been demanded.

Among Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan races alike,

it was also not regarded as disgraceful that women consecrated to some god, as temple dancers, should dispose of themselves as they pleased. In India the Basevi lives in her father's house, after his vow for her consecration has been fulfilled in the temple, and chooses her lovers at will. In cases where she has no brother, her son is regarded as the son of her father, and performs his funereal rites. But this does not appear to have originated the custom, which we find not only in India, but in Japan and China, among Babylonians, Phœnicians, and Canaanites, and in Corinth and Sicily, as well as at Carthage. The Lycians,[1] like the negroes of West Africa, traced descent through the mother—"in which," says Herodotus, "they differ from all other nations." Such a custom, no doubt, originated in cases where—as among the Basevis and the polyandrous Kols—the paternity of the child could not be established. But the "matriarchate" appears to be a modern theory, based on misunderstanding, and it is impossible to suppose that among early races, who regarded women as inferior to men, it could have been a general custom to obey female rulers, or to regard the mother as more important than the father. Turanian races especially have developed such extraordinary ideas of hospitality that the Tartar still offers wife and daughters to his guests; and the custom also prevailed till quite recently in Egypt,[2] and among the Bedouin according to Burckhardt.

Customs connected with birth (like that of the *Couvade* already noticed) seem to be based on anxiety lest the infant should die, and lest the evil eye of the envious should fall on it, and the witch or the wicked demons should injure or steal it. The child's name,

[1] Herodotus, i. 173. See Forlong's "Faiths of Man," 1906, *s.v. Basevi.*

[2] Lane, "Modern Egyptians," 1871, i. p. 365.

among all nations, was taken from the first propitious exclamation of thankfulness by a pious parent, or from some peculiar occurrence at the time of birth. Parents regarded their children as property over which they had absolute rights; and, unless the father acknowledged the infant and desired to rear it, it was customary to expose it as a prey to savage beasts, or to set it afloat in its cradle on the river: in which customs many legends originate, such as that of Romulus and Remus, which occurs also in Mongol mythology,[1] or the tales of Sargina, Perseus, and Darab.

Infanticide continued to be common among the Romans in our second century, and the Arabs buried daughters alive as sacrifices to their goddess down to the time of Muhammad. But those who exposed their infants, instead of killing them, consoled themselves with the belief that the gods would preserve the child if it were destined to a great fortune in later life.

Customs connected with death spring from the fear of the ghost, which we trace among the earliest known races. Pestilence due to leaving corpses unburied was attributed to the anger of the dead; and in order to appease them, and to prevent their spirits from haunting the living, various precautions were taken. In very early times the corpse was given to the dogs, and the Persians preserved this savage custom very late. In Mongolia and Tibet it is still regarded as an honourable form of burial, and dogs are kept at the lama monasteries for the purpose. But the commonest custom—even among Neolithic tribes—was burial under a solid mound, sometimes at great depth. The Goths turned the course of a river over such mounds; and in other cases the body was dissected, with the idea of preventing its reanimation. We find cases of this in Egypt, where, perhaps, the persons

[1] De Gubernatis, "Zoological Mythology," 1872, ii. p. 144.

whose bones have been carefully separated may have been regarded as witches. The suicide—whose ghost was specially malignant—was buried with a stake through the body, in the middle ages, for the same reason.

The ghost was thought to haunt the tomb, and to be satisfied when the body was found in good condition. It was well, therefore, to appease it by pious care of the corpse, which was mummified by Egyptians, Guanchos, Palmyrenes, Abyssinians, and others—though the removal of the brain and entrails seems to suggest that resurrection was neither expected nor desired. In dolmen tombs, as well as in the pyramids, a narrow air-passage from the chamber to the outside of the monument allowed free passage for the flitting ghost. Everything that the dead man could need in the other world was placed in the tomb, that the ghosts of his wives, slaves, horses, weapons, and tools might accompany him. In later times, among the Chinese, paper imitations were considered sufficient; but not only did such murderous rites exist among Scythians, as described by Herodotus, but we also find slaves to have been so slain at the tomb of Amenophis II., while the Indian widow-burning has the same origin. The ancient tomb at Jewurgi, in Western India, is an example—the pit being full of bodies, sometimes with the heads cut off, lying above the cist in which two corpses were carefully laid.[1] In the earliest tombs of Europe and Asia alike the dead are placed in a contracted attitude, with the knees bent up in front. In other cases—as among the Polynesians—the corpse was tightly bound, and sometimes it was nailed to its coffin. Food was laid beside it, and children's tombs contain toys in Egypt and alphabets in Etruria. In all cases the object

[1] Herodotus, iv. 72; Fergusson, "Rude Stone Monuments," 1872, p. 471.

appears to be to render the spirit content with its condition, and to prevent the return of the ghost. The coffin was, indeed, sometimes turned round and round on the way to the cemetery, to confuse the ghost and prevent its remembering the way home; or the cemetery was placed beyond a river, or on an island, for the same reason.

Burning the corpse appears to be a later practice than burial; and, as it was expensive and tedious, was generally confined to the upper class of chiefs and rich men. The early Greeks at Mycenæ appear to have burned the body in the tomb, as the Japanese still do. In Palestine, and at Susa, bodies of infants and of grown persons have been found which were cremated inside clay or pottery coffins. The funeral pyre is distinctive of Aryan races both in Britain and in India. The ashes were carefully preserved, and even the Persians, who gave the dead to dogs and vultures, gathered the bones afterwards [1]—just as the Iron tribes of the Caucasus still expose the dead, and afterwards gather the bones in bags. But these tribes appear to have a belief in resurrection of the body from the bones, which belongs to a later age. The Semitic people regarded burning the corpse with horror, and the Akkadians also buried the dead under mounds. The preservation of bodies in wax is mentioned by Herodotus; and the Babylonians and Hebrews preserved it in honey, or more probably covered it with honeycombs—a custom noticed in the book of Job.[2] Spiced unguents finally represented among the Jews the only trace of older attempts to preserve the body.

The customs thus described are so widely spread that they indicate a very early origin; showing us that man, even from the first, had some dim ethical ideas and some vague religious conceptions. As far as we

[1] Herodotus, i. 140.

[2] Job xxi. 33: "the bee-clods are sweet on him."

can trace him back in caves, dolmens, and tombs, we find a belief in spirits which is also traceable in his earliest speech. He was something more than a beast, though thought and arts were still in their infancy. The more we inquire into savage customs, even among Negrillos, the more do we find that there is no race which is entirely without belief in spirits, though they may not have risen to the conception of order and guidance in the universe. The same lesson which we learn from the history of species, and from the history of early man, is, however, yet more clearly taught by the course of his progress in the five or six thousand years which embrace the whole of actual history from the dawn of Asiatic civilisation.

CHAPTER III

CIVILISATION

i. Ancient History (3000 B.C. to 300 A.D.).—The history of man is like the history of the earth on which he dwells. It has its times of sunshine and of storm, its great floods and ebbs, its volcanic outbursts and its slow imperceptible secular changes. Nations are born and grow old, like men; and, as in geological so in historical progress, the earliest ages are the longest and the least complex in development. We are apt to regard history from an exclusively European standpoint, and to fix our attention solely on later events which affected our own destiny. To understand aright the origin of civilisation we must turn to Asia, where we find Akkadian dominance for at least a thousand years to be the most important feature. That age was followed by fifteen hundred years of Semitic progress, before the time when—for five centuries—Persia and Greece occupy the scene. Five more centuries represent Roman empire, followed by a thousand years during which Europe was struggling for mastery. It is only during the last four hundred years that the centre of civilisation has shifted from the old home of its birth to the new home in Western Europe. We have no history before the appearance of written records in Asia, and no chronology before the foundation of Babylon in 2250 B.C. We should be careful to distinguish what is actually proved from that which is conjectured, and contemporary evidence from the

beliefs of later writers. If we are to believe the Babylonians of the sixth century B.C., the ancient Akkadian civilisation endured for some two thousand years before the growth of any Semitic power. But Sargina, "the founder king," who ruled from Persia to the Mediterranean, is only a dim traditional figure.[1] The Akkadian empire may have endured for a third of the whole period of human civilisation, but the estimated age may on the other hand have been exaggerated by tradition. In Egypt we have no ancient chronology at all, but a moderate estimate from the lists of kings on monuments would indicate that the pyramids were built about 3000 B.C. These lists unfortunately do not even give us the length of the reigns, or any other chronological data.

In Egypt civilisation appears so suddenly, and so completely developed, as to suggest that it was imported from Asia. The civilisers were not of necessity of the original race which spoke the Egyptian language. They resemble (as portrayed on the ancient slate bas-reliefs) the non-Semitic race of Western Asia; but the accompanying hieroglyphs are already distinctively Egyptian in form and in language. The discovery of flint instruments, and of a rude art (like that of later Libyans) in Egypt does not of necessity indicate any remote age; for flint continued to be used side by side with metals imported from Asia, and rude cheap art is everywhere found side by side with more careful and expensive work, thus representing the difference between the productions of great artists and those of their humbler imitators who sold to the poor.

In the lower valley of the Euphrates and Tigris—the plain of the "Kaldi" as they are called in inscrip-

[1] A very archaic votive text, from Nippur, records the conquests of a king (*lugal*) whose name has been very doubtfully read as *Zaggisi*, but is more probably *Sargin*. Its date is quite unknown.

tions—the first distinct figure is that of Gudea, prince of Zirgul, under Dungi, King of Uru.[1] The later Babylonians believed him to have lived about 2800 B.C., and the texts on his great granite statues are written in the Akkadian language, while the type of his portraits is very clearly Mongolic and not Semitic. Zirgul (now Tell Loh) was a city west of the Tigris, and east of Babylon, near the great canal which ran from the Tigris to the Euphrates. The citadel of burnt brick, set in bitumen, included one of those stepped pyramids, with angles facing the four points of the compass, which may have been the prototypes of the Egyptian tombs, but which, in Chaldea, led to a shrine or observatory on the summit. The eight statues of Gudea are of Sinaitic granite, and one of the texts informs us that this stone was brought in a ship from Māgan (" ship-port "), a region which later Assyrian texts place near to Egypt. Gudea also brought gold dust from Melukha, which was the Assyrian name for Upper Egypt in later ages, so that it seems clear that the Akkadians were then able to coast round Arabia, and up the Red Sea to Suez or to some such port near Sinai and Egypt. The records of this prince inform us that he ruled from Ansan—near Susa, east of the Tigris—to Martu or Syria, and from the lower sea (perhaps the Caspian) to the upper sea or Persian Gulf. The inscriptions speak of silver, gold, bronze, and copper, and of trees (no doubt cedars) brought from Amanus or the Northern Lebanon. The materials actually found at the site include marble and alabaster, with cylinders of lapis lazuli. Even iron knives with bone handles are found. The primitive art of the statues and bas-reliefs shows a considerable civilisation. The harp was already an instrument of music, and the hieroglyphic signs include sketches of bow, ship, sail, chariot, throne, and pyramid. Endowments of temples

[1] E. De Sarzec, " Découvertes en Chaldée," 1887.

are recorded in these texts, and Prince Gudea prides himself on the happiness and safety of those who willingly offered contributions to the building of his city and shrine. It may be noted that, according to the Phœnician priests, the great city of Tyre was first founded about the same time,[1] and we cannot doubt that already about four thousand seven hundred years ago the tribal princes who reigned in various towns of Mesopotamia had confederated themselves under the Kings of Uru—near the mouth of the Euphrates—and were in peaceful trading relations with Phœnicia, Palestine, and Egypt.

We have a great many Akkadian inscriptions which were copied and translated by the Assyrians of the seventh century B.C.,[2] and which give us clear information as to their customs and beliefs; but these are undated, and the originals may have belonged to a time many centuries later than that of Gudea. One such fragment gives us the rude Draconic laws of this stern practical race. The rebellious son was branded and sold as a slave, the rebellious wife was drowned in the river, and the husband who denied his marriage was heavily fined. The Chaldean rulers, however, prided themselves not only on justice, but on their piety and care for the oppressed.

The ships of Gudea, anchoring in the Gulf of Suez, enabled the Akkadians to communicate with Egyptians, who already were working mines of "blue stone" and copper in the Sinaitic Peninsula; for Senefru, the last king of the third Egyptian dynasty, set up his record at Wady el Magharah (the "Valley

[1] Herodotus, ii. 44.

[2] See Lenormant, "Études Accadiennes," 6 vols. 1873–80; "Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania" (to Nippur), Prof. Hilprecht, 10 vols. 1888–96; Chantre, "Mission en Cappadoce," 1890; De Morgan, "Fouilles à Suse," 1897–99; Humann and Puchstein, "Reisen," 1890.

of the Cave"), as did also Khufu, the builder of the first pyramid, his successor, and founder of the fourth dynasty. Towards the close of the pre-Semitic age the Egyptian power appears to have increased considerably under the great twelfth dynasty, and the land of Punt (probably Somali-land) was known, while part of Southern Palestine was also under Egyptian influence, judging from the scarabs which have been unearthed in the ruins of Gezer. Under the second king of this dynasty (Usertasen I.), we find it stated, by the refugee Saneha, that the Pharaohs "did not covet the lands of the north," but they were pushing up the Nile to Coptos. The inscription of Ameni[1] shows us that Egyptian officials then acknowledged a high ethical standard of conduct. He was "a prince who loved his town," and tells us that while highly praised by his master for his activity, "I never afflicted the child of the poor; I have not ill-treated the widow: I never disturbed the owner of the land: I never drove away the herdsman." "There were none wretched in my time, the hungry did not exist in my time, even when there were years of famine." "I did not prefer a great person to a humble man in all that I gave away." The indications of peaceful rule and trade, of piety and justice, in this early age of civilisation, are thus to be found in Asia and in Egypt alike.

The kings of Uru, who conquered the Susian region east of the Tigris, appear to have been succeeded by kings of the same race whose capital was at Susa. They ruled not only in Sinim (or Elam), which was the "high land" or plateau of Western Persia, but also in Martu or "the West," according to a text which records the invasion of Chaldea shortly before the foundation of Babylon, and another which prays for the life of the Elamite

[1] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," 1879, i. p. 135.

king, father of Arioch prince of Larsa, who is termed "Chief of the West." But to the north of the new capital on the Euphrates lay the land of the Kassites (or "smiters"), who were also of Turanian race. Their civilisation was very similar to that of Uru, but the names of their gods are distinct, and their hieroglyphic system, though closely connected with that of Gudea's texts, was also distinctive.[1] This system, popularly known as Hittite, is found on a very archaic bas-relief at Babylon itself,[2] as well as in Syria and Cappadocia, and throughout Asia Minor to the shores of Ionia. It was the foundation of that syllabary from which, a thousand years later, the Phœnician alphabet developed, and which was the earliest script used by the Greeks, surviving to a late period in Cyprus, Crete, Egypt, and even on the coins of Kelt-Iberian regions in Spain. The pottery which has been dug up in Cappadocian ruins, where Hittite texts and sculptures are found, is not only similar to that of early Canaanites, but was also carried by trade to Troy, Mycenæ, and Egypt. In a later age it reached Italy as well, after the Etruscan emigration from Lydia. The art of this Hittite or Kassite race was practically the same as that of the Akkadians. The winged sphinx, which appears in Egypt after the time of the twelfth dynasty, was a Hittite and a Chaldean emblem, as was also the double-headed eagle found at Pterium as well as at Zirgul. This art was destined profoundly to affect the Aryans, when the Greeks began to copy the Lydians and the Romans adopted the Etruscan culture.

The winged sun was another symbol common to Egyptians, Hittites, and Akkadians, and besides these emblems others which gradually spread over the

[1] See my "Hittites and their Language," 1898, pp. 216–47.

[2] See Koldewey, "Die Hettitische Inschrift," 1900.

whole world were of Turanian origin, including the lucky hand, the cross, the swastika, the caduceus, the trident, and the crescent with the star.[1] The system of weights and measures adopted by the Semitic Babylonians, and by the Phœnicians, lies at the base of all European metrology, and finds its origin not in Egypt—where, however, it was apparently adopted—but among the Akkadians and Hittites, whose trade extended to the Delta and to the shores of Greece.

The foundation of Babylon in 2250 B.C. marks a new era in Asiatic civilisation. A damaged chronicle of the first dynasty written in Akkadian has been recovered, showing that the first king—Sumuabi—extended his conquests to Aleppo. The Akkadian language continues to be used in texts of 'Ammurabi, the famous sixth king of Babylon,[2] and down to the end of the dynasty; but we have no historic texts of the first five kings, though their names occur in chronicles and as dating Semitic tablets connected with commerce and property. The family may have been Kassite, and the earlier kings may have used the northern or Hittite script, but the Semitic race was now coming rapidly to the front as a trading class, and a mixed nation showed a vigour and activity which surpassed that of their Elamite overlords. 'Ammurabi (who is generally held to have been the Amraphel of the book of Genesis) reigned in Babylon for forty-five years, and appears to have mainly depended on his Semitic subjects when striving to shake off the Elamite yoke. His chronicle, unfortunately, is much damaged, especially in the middle

[1] Count Goblet D'Alviella, "Migration of Symbols" (English translation), 1894.

[2] This seems a more correct rendering of the name than either Hammurabi or Khammurabi. It has also been found spelt Ammurapi.

part. He began by peaceful development of his kingdom, and in his ninth year he dug the famous canal which bore his name. No doubt, like his predecessors, he carried his arms to the West, for in his time the mixed hordes of Asia were already invading the Egyptian Delta; but it was only in the thirtieth year of 'Ammurabi's reign that the Elamites were conquered, and Babylon became the capital of a new empire. We know from an Akkadian text that this great statesman and victorious warrior subdued Susa itself. He defeated Eriaku, son of the Elamite king, at Larsa in Chaldea. This monarch (of whom several texts exist) was apparently the Arioch of Ellasar noticed in Genesis as a contemporary of Amraphel before the time of the Elamite war. On the destruction of his power, Sinidinnam—a Semitic prince—was set up as governor of the south and west by the conqueror, 'Ammurabi, and we possess no less than forty-seven letters in Semitic-Babylonian written to this governor by 'Ammurabi himself. These give us a clear picture of the civilisation of the age, and of the centralised government which this energetic monarch established. They refer not only to the cultivation of corn, sesame and dates, to oil and wine, to cattle and sheep, canals and ships, trade, money, and mortgages, but even to the proclamation of the intercalary month, showing the calendar to have been finally settled. They refer also to laws against bribery of officials, who were severely punished for fraud or rebellion, and they show the power of Babylon to have extended over Assyria as well as Elam.

Among other records of this great reign is a bilingual poem, in Akkadian and Semitic speech, which relates in a hundred and twenty-six lines (on a black stone) the glories of 'Ammurabi, his courage and piety, and the vastness of his empire, covering the greater part of Wsstern Asia. Still more remarkable, however, is

his great stela of about two hundred and eighty laws, recently discovered by De Morgan at Susa. The bas-relief at the top represents the king worshipping the sun-god. The type of his face is not distinctively Semitic; though (as also in another of his portraits) he has a long beard such as is rarely found in Akkadian statues. The laws are declared to have had divine sanction by the formula "Thus God has commanded us"; but the enumeration of temples, and of deities, shows clearly that 'Ammurabi worshipped many gods. The cities mentioned include not only Babylon, Sippara, Erech, Borsippa, Zirgul, and Agade, but also Nineveh, in the land of Ausar, which is independently known to have been the old name of Assyria. The laws themselves[1] have reference to a wide range of subjects, beginning with the suppression of witchcraft, and the rights of property and women: they treat of assaults and damages, and are remarkable for the severity of the punishments and for the ancient principle of "an eye for an eye." They refer to slaves and tenants, irrigation, grazing and gardens, to merchants and their agents, to women keeping wineshops, to trusts, debts, and storage. They regulate divorce, and questions of immorality, breach of promise of marriage, inheritance, and adoption: they lay down the fees of doctors and their responsibilities: they treat questions of branding slaves, boat-building, and the wages of herdsmen, damages by or to cattle, trespass, and the price of slaves. In all cases rights were proved by the production of tablets of agreement duly signed and witnessed. The Babylonian traders penetrated at this time to Cappadocia and the west, where their agents purchased metals, cloth, mules, and horses. Houses, gardens, and date-groves were rented and mortgaged, and special privileges were ordained for royal messengers and

[1] Johns, "Oldest Code of Laws in the World," 1903.

officials, or for soldiers absent on service, as well as for the temple women and priests. The reign of 'Ammurabi (2139–2094 B.C.) was remembered ever after by Babylonians as the brightest age of their civilisation and empire. At a time when the Hebrews were represented by a small family of wandering shepherds, the arms and trade of a great Semitic empire extended from Persia to Cappadocia, and from Nineveh to the Nile.

The power of the Akkadians and of the Babylonians alike appears to have been due in great measure to their use of horses and chariots. In Egypt and Edom the ass alone is found in use down to the time of the twelfth dynasty, and the names for "horse" and "chariot," which appear in Egyptian after the invasion of the Delta by Asiatic Hyksos, are both borrowed from Semitic speech. The Hyksos themselves appear to have been non-Semitic (as indicated by the names of their kings), and they worshipped the Hittite god Sutekh, or Sut, according to the records of the reign of Apepi; but the mixed population of Canaan, which overflowed the limits of the Babylonian Empire and established non-Egyptian dynasties at Zoan, Xois, and other cities, appears to have included a large Semitic element. Babylonian power remained without a rival down to the end of the first dynasty in 1957 B.C., and even a century later we find Ismi-Dagon, ruler of Assyria (and probably of part of Chaldea), to be still a prince subordinate to the Babylonian suzerain. About 1700 B.C., however, Belkapkapu appears as King of Assyria, and the second dynasty of Babylon (whose names are still Turanian) decreased in power just about the time when the energetic eighteenth dynasty at Thebes began to push its conquests northwards, and to expel the Asiatics from the Delta. The third dynasty of Babylon (1589 to 1500 B.C.) was Kassite,

but its kings seem to have been of small importance, while the power of Nineveh was steadily increasing under Semitic rulers. The loss of Syria, which the Egyptians conquered, was thus apparently due to the struggle between Babylon and Nineveh, which was that of the decaying Kassites against the vigorous Semitic race of Assyria.

The Egyptians, adopting war-chariots and drilling their forces, conquered the trade route to Mesopotamia under Thothmes I. His younger son, Thothmes III., was perhaps the greatest of the Pharaohs. Small and slight, with delicate features, he was yet a hardy soldier, who, after his great victory at Megiddo, continued for twenty years to exact tribute in Canaan, establishing military stations where his troops were regularly rationed by the Syrians. The native population in Palestine was Semitic, but in North Syria the town-names indicate that it was partly Turanian or Hittite. The art and civilisation of Syria—as shown by spoil-lists, pictures, and cuneiform tablets—were similar to those of the old Babylonian Empire. The trade route led through Philistia and across Central Palestine to Damascus, and thence by the valley of the Orontes to Aleppo, and to Carchemish, the Hittite capital, at the ford of the Euphrates. It was held—with intervals of revolt—by Egypt for five centuries, and even after 1200 B.C. Syria and Palestine continued to look to Egypt for support against the gradual extension of Assyrian power.

The Babylonian Empire broke up into rival states. Elam became independent under non-Semitic kings. In Babylonia the Kassites struggled against Nineveh until, about 1440 B.C., Burnaburias—the contemporary of Amenophis IV.—married a daughter of the Assyrian king Assur-uballid and settled a boundary on the River Zab between their dominions. In Armenia

the Minyan kings of Matiene were of the same Kassite race, and claimed suzerainty over the Hittite tribes of Syria. The Pharaohs were allied by marriage with these Minyans, who had ruled in the Delta during the Hyksos age,[1] and in three successive generations Thothmes IV., Amenophis III., and Amenophis IV., wedded Armenian wives. These monarchs were also intermarried with the Kassites of Babylon; and a peaceful trading intercourse was established between Egypt and Asia under the protection of these politic alliances. Even the famous Queen Teie, mother of Amenophis IV., would seem to have been related to Dusratta, king of Matiene, whose sister Gilukhepa had been the first bride of Amenophis III. The mummies of Yuao and Tuao, the parents of Teie, have quite recently been found in Egypt, and their faces indicate their non-Egyptian race. Under the influence of these Asiatic queens Babylonian religion began to spread in the Egyptian court. Tablets relating Semitic myths are included in the Amarna correspondence, and Amenophis IV. adored the sun-god of his mother, although his Asiatic correspondents address him as a worshipper of the Egyptian god Amen, whose name he bore.[2]

In the reign of this prince the rebellion of Syria, which began in the closing years of his father's peaceful rule, proved successful, and led to the ruin of the eighteenth dynasty. The Hittites attacked the Semitic Amorites in the far north, and the latter, under Aziru, invaded Phœnicia and captured the great trading cities, Simyra, Gebal, Beirut, and Sidon. Aided by a fleet from Arvad they besieged Tyre, and they spread all over Bashan and Gilead. In the south

[1] See Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i. pp. 233, 236.

[2] The tomb of Teie is supposed to have been found in 1907 near Thebes, but the mummy is that of Amenophis IV. His name, Khu-en-Aten, has been purposely defaced.

the fierce 'Abiri, or Hebrews, broke in from Seir, and exterminated the Canaanite kings, who wrote in vain to Egypt for help. They conquered Lachish and Askelon, and the Egyptian archers were withdrawn from Jerusalem.[1] The reconquest of the trade route by the nineteenth dynasty had to be begun from the extreme south, and though Seti I. has left us a tablet in Bashan, and Rameses II. carried his arms to Aleppo, the Hittites, who had become independent rulers as far south as Kadesh on the Orontes, were strong enough to exact a treaty of equal rights from this great conqueror. In his time the blue-eyed, fair races of Asia Minor—Dardani and other Aryans—began to press down on Syria, and in the reign of Merenptah (Mineptah), his son, they even invaded Egypt by sea and land, in alliance with the fair Libyans, who appear to have been early Greek colonists from Ionia and Crete. Merenptah was allied to the Hittites, and may possibly have been the son of the Hittite princess whom his father married some thirty years before death. He repelled the invaders and recovered the trade route, and he tells us that "the people of Israel" were ruined by his destruction of their corn. The Hebrews were driven to their mountains, and even as late as 1200 B.C. Rameses III. was powerful in Sinai, and along the Syrian coasts as far north as Carchemish.

The struggle between Nineveh and Babylon continued. In 1154 B.C. a powerful Semitic monarch—Nabu-cudur-usur—ruling Babylon, claimed victories in Syria, before he was defeated by Tiglath-pileser of Assyria. On the death of Nabu-cudur-usur, in 1128 B.C., his dominions were divided between his two sons. Marduk-nadin-akhi acceded in Babylon and defeated Tiglath-pileser, while the parallel Chaldean dynasties begin with the name of Bel-nadin-

[1] See my "Tell Amarna Tablets," 2nd edit. 1894.

ablu, the younger son of Nabu-cudur-usur. The Kassites, however, recovered power in Babylon during this age of struggle, and Kassite names occur in the lists down to the time of the Assyrian conquest (in 1010 B.C.) of all Mesopotamia.

The power of Egypt steadily decayed after 1200 B.C., and Rameses III. was the last of the great Pharaohs, rescuing his country from anarchy, and from the rule of a Semitic Phœnician named Hareth. During the age of decay which followed we have few records in either Egypt or Assyria; but it appears that a temporary peace with Babylon was established by Assur-bel-kala of Assyria about 1100 B.C., after his defeat by Kadasman Burias, the Kassite, and about the same time we find that an Assyrian prince, Naram-addu, son of Sheshonk, the "great king of Assyria," was buried at Abydos in Egypt:[1] so that the old policy of marriage alliance with Asiatics seems still to have prevailed, for Naram-addu was the son of the Egyptian princess Mehet-en-usekh, who was probably a daughter of Rameses XIV. The decay of the great ruling races was the opportunity for the Hebrews, and the kingdom of Solomon extended to the Euphrates at a time when Egypt was weak and Assyria still engaged with the Kassites. After Solomon's death a new dynasty of kings, descended from Naram-addu, arose in Egypt, and Sheshonk (or Shishak) pillaged Jerusalem and conquered Galilee, as we know from his list of towns ravaged in Palestine. But this revival of Egyptian power over the small princes of Judah and of Israel did not long endure when Assyria became supreme east of the Euphrates. Year after year the great cloud from the north spread terror in Syria. The Hittites were conquered, and Damascus was attacked when Jehu—about 840 B.C.—gave tribute to Shalmaneser II. In 732 B.C. Tiglath-pileser III. finally

[1] See Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii. p. 199.

annexed Syria, and raided Philistia and Northern Arabia, while ten years later Samaria fell to Sargon, the first king of a new Assyrian dynasty. Judah gave tribute to Sennacherib and to his successors, and in 670 B.C. the Nubian king Tirhakah was pursued by Esarhaddon from Memphis to Thebes, and was led captive with a ring through his lip, as represented on the stela of victory found at Samala in North Syria. Thus, with the accession of Assur-bani-pal in 668 B.C., we reach the summit of Assyrian power. During his reign Susa was again conquered, and rebellion in Babylon—in spite of alliance with Judah, Arabia, and Egypt—was put down, the king of Nineveh becoming the suzerain of nearly the whole of Western Asia, and establishing Assyrian governors in various cities of Egypt.

Assyrian tyranny may have been one cause of the extension of Phœnician trade with the West; for the kings of Sidon fled before these invaders to Cyprus, while Tyre established a new centre at Carthage about 850 B.C. It is true that Phœnician fleets in the Mediterranean are noticed as early as 1500 B.C., and Sidonians and Arvadites established colonies in all the Greek islands long before the "new city" of Carthage came into existence; but from this western base the Tyrians extended their trade to Sicily and South Italy, to Marseilles in France, and to Cadiz in Spain. The Semitic influence followed that of the Turanians of Asia Minor in Greece, and the wild Aryan tribes of the Mediterranean coast began to trade with Phœnicians and with Greek islanders, who gradually took from the Etruscans the mastery of the sea.

It is remarkable that the empire of Assyria collapsed suddenly after the death of Assur-bani-pal, which occurred about 625 B.C., but the causes of this collapse are not difficult to find. The "bloody city" of Nineveh was justly hated, for the Assyrians were a

cruel race, and their policy of transplanting whole populations from their homes—though for a time successful—led to general discontent throughout the empire. Assur-bani-pal appears to have been personally a very remarkable statesman. His political correspondence still exists, and shows that he was capable of conciliating his subjects by his clemency and accessibility, while—like 'Ammurabi—he concentrated the whole government of the empire in his own hands, at Nineveh or at Babylon according as his presence was most needed. But the bas-reliefs which represent his Elamite captives being flayed alive, and having their tongues pulled out, or that which shows him seated with his queen on a throne in his garden, drinking wine, and gazing at the salted head of Te-Umman, the defeated king of Elam, hanging in a tree, show us that, in spite of literature, art, and religion, which all flourished especially during his reign, the Assyrian was still a savage at heart. Babylon, Syria, and Egypt alike detested the rule of Nineveh, and a new force appeared in Asia in the growing power of the Medes and Persians.

As early as about 820 B.C. Shamash Rimmon of Assyria came into contact with the Aryan Medes, who dominated the old Turanian tribes to the north and north-east of his empire, west of the Caspian. These long-robed and long-haired warriors, with painted faces,[1] continued to threaten the border for two centuries, and some tribes seem even to have settled in Commagene, far west. About 800 B.C. Rimmon Nirari set up a bilingual text in Assyrian and Medic, to record his capture of the Medic king Ispuinis; and in 714 Sargon, in a similar bilingual, records the capture of King Urzana. From these inscriptions we learn that the Medes spoke an Iranian dialect closely connected with Sanskrit, and with the

[1] See Plutarch, "Crassus," and the Behistān bas-reliefs.

language of the Lycian texts after the conquest of the West by Harpagus.[1] The names of Medic kings are known from the ninth century down to the time of Cyrus,[2] and they appear to have adopted the civilisation of Assyria, and even perhaps the cuneiform script. The Aryans had thus settled south of the Caucasus about the same time that they began to spread east over Bactria, and over the Persian plateau, where they dominated the Turanians, whose power was destroyed finally by Assur-bani-pal. About 700 B.C. the pressure of population in South Russia had led to further inroads, and the Scythians drove the Cimmerians into Armenia. The latter attacked Gugu (Gyges), the founder of a new Aryan dynasty in Lydia having its capital at Sardis. They were only finally repelled by his successors, Ardys and Halyattes (689 to 628 B.C.); and hardly had they settled down on the shores of Pontus when the Scythian cavalry burst into Assyria, probably on the death of Assur-bani-pal.[3] These hordes carried confusion throughout the empire to the borders of Egypt, but on their retreat (perhaps about 595 B.C.) were destroyed by the treachery of their Medic cousins, who meanwhile, in alliance with the revolted governor of Babylon, had taken Nineveh (about 610 B.C.), and thus put an end to Assyrian power. The empire was divided between Medes on the north-east, Lydians —under Crœsus, who ruled Asia Minor west of the

[1] *Kustasp* of Commagene, in 734 B.C., bears a Medic name. The language of the Vannic texts was recognised as Aryan by Hinks. It is still little understood, but some fifty known words on the bilinguals are Aryan, and half of these are comparable with Sanskrit. For the bilinguals see *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1906, p. 612.

[2] Seduris (833 B.C.), Ispuinis, Menuas, Argistis (781 B.C.), Sarduris (743 B.C.), and Urzana (714 B.C.), precede Daiukku (about 710 B.C.), Fravatish (657 B.C.), who was killed by Assur-bani-pal, Kuakshares (636 B.C.), and Astuvegu or Astyages (595–552 B.C.), defeated by Cyrus.

[3] Herodotus, i. 15, 16, iv. 12.

River Halys—and Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar, whose kingdom included the Semitic regions and Egypt. But the old policy of Assyria was still pursued by the Babylonians, and the transportation of subject races still bred a deep hatred against them. The partition of West Asia lasted little more than half a century, until the defeat of Astyages by Cyrus in 552 B.C., and his subsequent conquest of Crœsus. After seventy years of Babylonian tyranny (607 to 538 B.C.) the great city fell to the Persian conqueror, who thus became supreme from India to the Mediterranean.

The great Persian family founded by Hakamanish, about 700 B.C., extended its rule to Ansan and Susa; and two branches of the family gave to Persia successive kings, of whom Cyrus was the seventh.[1] These kings were famous for their tolerance and love of truth, and they reversed the Assyrian policy. Cyrus allowed the Jews to return home; Cambyses, in 527 B.C., treated the temple of Neith in Egypt with reverence; Darius sent an Egyptian from Persia to rebuild the native shrines and to reinstate the Egyptian priests.[2] Persian rule was thus very willingly accepted by all the subject races. It encouraged Semitic trade, and the Persians adopted Babylonian art and civilisation. They soon, indeed, began to intermarry with the Babylonians,[3] and Semitic influences became strong in the empire. Although the original justice of the Persians began to give place to cruelty and tyranny under Xerxes, and although rebellions, fomented by the Greeks, occurred later in Phœnicia and in Egypt, the Persian

[1] Rawlinson, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, XII. i. 1880; Spiegel, "Alt-Persischen Keil-Inschriften," 1881; Oppert, "Les Mèdes," 1879.

[2] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii. pp. 293–6.

[3] Hilprecht, "Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania," ix. p. 28, "Texts of Artaxerxes I." (465–425 B.C.).

empire remained unshaken for two centuries, until the appearance of Alexander of Macedon. In wealth, in religion, and in organisation, it excelled that of Assyria, and in extent it became greater when, after 516 B.C., Darius I. added to his dominions a new province in the Panjāb.

When the Greeks became acquainted with India, after 326 B.C., they discovered a native civilisation equal to that of Persia, and apparently of Persian origin.[1] It may be that trade had already extended from Babylon to India much earlier; for the elephant and the rhinoceros appear on the "Black Obelisk" of Shalmaneser in 840 B.C. But no traces of cuneiform writing have been found east of the Indus, and the oldest alphabet of North India was derived from the Aramaic letters not earlier than about 500 B.C. In the south another alphabet was in use, perhaps quite as early, and appears to have been due to the Sabean Arab traders who came by sea.[2] Some elements of civilisation may have existed among Dravidian tribes, who were remotely akin to the Akkadians, but the history of India begins with the appearance of Aryans, who were an outlying detachment of the Iranian stock.

The great Maurya dynasty, with its capital at Patna, was founded by Chandra-Gupta about 321 B.C. His grandson Asoka (272 to 232 B.C.) ruled all India except a small region in the extreme south. These emperors commanded an army of nearly a million

[1] Vincent Smith, "Early History of India," p. 116.

[2] The Kharoshthi alphabet of the North—written from right to left—is generally admitted to be of Aramaic origin. The South Asoka script compares best with the Sabean or South Arab character, especially with the early Safa forms (Isaac Taylor, "Alphabet," ii. pp. 258, 320). This South Indian script was deciphered by Princep (*Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. vi.), and is written from left to right. It is notable that the Safa texts—from near Damascus—differ from other alphabetic Semitic inscriptions by being also sometimes written thus.

men. Their government included departments regulating industries, and the rights of foreigners, the registration of births and deaths, trade licences to merchants, manufactures, and the tithing of lands. Irrigation was as carefully regulated as that of Mesopotamia had been by 'Ammurabi. The Indians were as famous for honesty as their Persian cousins, and the ethical edicts of Asoka surpass in tone any known earlier pronouncements even in Persia. Asoka was in communication with his Greek contemporaries in Syria, Egypt, Cyrene, Macedonia, and Epirus, and his missionaries were received in Ceylon and perhaps in Burma. Throughout his empire the roads were marked every two thousand yards by milestones, while wells were dug, rest-houses built, and doctors and drugs provided. Alms were given to the monks of all sects: duty was taught on set days by provincial rulers; censors were appointed to regulate morals; and cruelty to animals was forbidden.[1] Thirty edicts, in various dialects and in several alphabets, record this civilisation from Mysore to the Himalayas, and from the Bay of Bengal to the Bombay coast, all over an empire stretching twelve hundred miles east and west, by eighteen hundred miles north and south—an area larger than that of the old Assyrian dominions.

Although this empire fell in 184 B.C., and was divided among Hindus on the north-east, Greco-Parthians and Tartars on the north-west, and Dravidians on the south, and although the later history of India is one of slow native decay and of foreign invasion, yet this new centre of civilisation, which was due to Persian expansion towards the east, became that from which the Hindus civilised Eastern Asia, dominating Burma and Siam, deeply influencing Central Asia, China, and finally Japan, through which,

[1] Asoka's "Rock Edicts," ii., v., xii.; "Pillar Edict," vii.

and through the south, they even left their mark in later times in both Mexico and Peru.

We have, unfortunately, in China no early historic inscriptions on which to base a true account of her civilisation, such as we have in India. Ssu-ma-ch'ien, the "father of history," dates only from 100 B.C. Accurate chronology is supposed to begin with an eclipse of the sun on August 29, 776 B.C.; but the book-burning edict of 221 B.C., though it was probably not carried out entirely, yet casts much doubt on Chinese assertions as to their traditional history. In the time of Confucius (551 to 478 B.C.) China consisted of various independent kingdoms, and even in that of Mencius (371–288 B.C.) there appears to have been no consolidated empire. The West Han dynasty (205 B.C. to 24 A.D.) marks the commencement of a new period of prosperity, and under their successors of the East Han family (24 to 421 A.D.) the power of China grew so great in Central Asia that it extended even to the Caspian, and included Afghanistan as a province. The Chinese were indeed never entirely cut off from the west of Asia, and it is believed that Assyrian trade extended far into Bactria, whence jade was brought to Babylonia. But we have as yet no records to show the origin of Chinese civilisation, though their religious beliefs, their astronomy, their highly developed system of irrigation, and probably their script, seem to show that the Chinese were emigrants who took to the far East the civilisation of the kindred Akkadians who first founded it in Mesopotamia.

The oldest known Chinese texts, on stone drums recording hunting adventures, are attributed to the Chow dynasty (827 to 782 B.C.), and they show that the art of writing had then been long in use.[1] But the Chinese system can only be completely studied in the Shwoh-wan, about 100 B.C., and there is a gap of

[1] See *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, N. China Branch, viii. p. 133.

at least a thousand years between the oldest texts and those of the Akkadians and Kassites.[1] The immense total of forty thousand characters, derived from the nine thousand five hundred emblems of the Shwohwan, has been further reduced to an original list of not more than three hundred signs. When these are compared with the Hittite and the Akkadian hieroglyphics the emblems are found to be the same in about forty cases, but the sounds attached to them are different. Hence it appears that, although the Chinese may have founded their characters on those of Mesopotamia perhaps as early as 2000 B.C., yet long ages of separate development must have followed. Many of their oldest signs are peculiar to themselves (including those for numerals), and are never found in the hieroglyphic systems of the West. The same remark applies to the Chinese language, which has gradually changed in the course of ages. It is not difficult to show that it is connected with Mongolian, and thus ultimately with the Akkadian; but it developed as a distinct tongue which can only be regarded as having a very remote relation to the original speech of the civilised Turanians of Chaldea.

The history of Japan is intimately connected with that of China. The mixed Japanese race appears originally to have come from Korea, and to have been akin to the Samoyed Turanians, who mingled with Aino aborigines and with Malays from the South. But tradition goes back only to 660 B.C. for the arrival of the first divine Emperor, Jimmu Tennu. The civilisation of Japan is almost entirely of Chinese origin, and though Sanskrit texts of Buddhist writings have been found, they date only from 252 A.D.[2] The script of Japan, in like manner, was a syllabary derived from the Chinese characters; but the language

[1] See Chalmers, "Structure of Chinese Characters," 1882, p. v.

[2] Max Müller, "Selected Essays," 1881, vol. ii. p. 341.

of the Nipon Islands was not Chinese, although it was also a Turanian agglutinative tongue.

When we turn from this great story of a civilisation in Asia, which grew and spread east and west from the Euphrates during a period of more than two thousand years, to consider the contemporary history of Europe, we are plunged at first into barbarism among the illiterate Aryans, who swarmed from their home on the Volga, and reached Greece and Italy, perhaps as early as 2000 B.C. It is quite possible that the Trojan war took place about 1200 B.C., and the Dorian invasion a century later, for we know that Aryan tribes were invading Asia Minor and Syria about that time, including Danai and Dardani, as recorded by Rameses II. and Rameses III. But the early civilisation of Troy and Mycenæ was Asiatic, and the first race at Troy is non-Aryan and apparently Turanian. The long-headed people of Schliemann's "third city" were probably Aryans, and the Trojans were akin to the Phrygians, and perhaps—judging from the black hair of Hector, who had a Phrygian mother—to the dark race of Crete. The great walls of Mycenæ, however, were traditionally said to have been built by a "round-faced" people from Lycia,[1] and the art of the treasures there found is similar to that of the Turanians of Asia Minor, as described on the dowry list of Tadukhepa, the daughter of Dusratta the Minyan king, in the fifteenth century B.C., and as discovered in the Hittite ruins of Cappadocia. All the art of the Greek islands in early times is equally Asiatic in character. At Troy, in the first city, jade is found, which must have been brought by traders from Central Asia, and Egyptian porcelain occurs in the third or burnt city about 1200 B.C. But the Aryans, then adopting foreign art, seem to have been still illiterate. Only a few short

[1] Strabo, viii. 6. See Schliemann, "Mycenæ," 1878; "Ilios," 1880.

texts in the old syllabary of the Hittite tribes are found early, at either Troy or Mycenæ, and the weights are also uninscribed, though referable to a Babylonian unit. The use of brick at Troy, and among the Lydians, is another indication of this Eastern influence. The first dated Aryan texts in alphabetic script are those of the Ionian and Carian mercenaries, who went up the Nile about 600 B.C., and scrawled their record and names on the legs of the colossal statue of Amenophis III.; but the Phrygian inscriptions are thought to have been earlier. The use of the old syllabary continued among Arcadian Greeks in Cyprus as late as the fourth century B.C.; and though the clay tablets found by Mr. Evans at Knossos, in Crete, resemble those used much earlier by Cappadocian Hittites, yet the script is so clearly connected with that of Cyprus that these texts may also have been written very late.[1]

The art of Crete is distinctively Greek, and, as in Cyprus, the syllabic texts are probably written in Greek. The oldest remains may go back to 1500 B.C., but the masonry at Knossos seems to be later than that of Mycenæ. The appearance of an ancient statue stolen from Egypt gives no indication of date, and on the other hand the plumes of the peacock are painted in one fresco—a bird which seems not to have been known in the West till the Persian age, though it had perhaps been brought to Solomon by traders from Tarsus as early as 1000 B.C.[2] The broken text on a libation table, in the Diktaian cave on Mount Ida,

[1] See my "First Bible," 1902, p. 215.

[2] See "Annual, British School of Athens," 1899–1900; "Journal of Hellenic Studies," XIV. ii. 1894; "Further Discoveries of Cretan and Ægean Script," by A. J. Evans, 1898. The representation of the cock on the gems, the use of swords, and of the fibula, all indicate a late age. See my letter on the Cretan texts, *Times*, April 16, 1901.

appears to read in Greek (*He tou topou hiera*—"the goddess of the place"), and the monetary texts on the clay tablets can also be rendered in Greek. But Cretan civilisation owed much to foreign trade. The camel occurs on a gem; lapis lazuli came no doubt from Asia, as did the obsidian for knives; and amber reached Crete from Sicily; but none of these indications tell us anything about the age of the remains. The art of the gems is archaic, but that of the Greeks in Lycia and Cyprus was equally archaic in the fifth century B.C. It was only about 430 B.C. that Pheidias and Zeuxis became famous in Greece itself, and Praxiteles dates yet later, about 350 B.C. The Greeks took the idea of a coinage from Lydians and Persians, but the beauty of their coins dates back only to those of Alexander. The Hellenes far surpassed their old masters in painting, sculpture, and science, but they served a long apprenticeship before they threw aside the old conventions; and the progress of outlying islands was naturally slower than that of Athens.

When Lycurgus gave laws to Sparta, about 850 B.C., the Lacedemonians had initiatory rites for boys, and lent their wives like Australian savages; and even when Solon became archon in Athens (in 594 B.C.) human sacrifice was a Greek custom.[1] The Greeks in character closely resembled the Kelts. They possessed the same poetic genius. The Aryan love of freedom, and the passionate artistic disposition rendered them as quarrelsome, treacherous, and jealous as the Keltic peoples also were. When we consider that the small Greek cities of Thebes, Athens, Corinth, Argos, and Sparta lay within a peninsula measuring only two hundred and fifty miles from north to south, we can but regard their endless and bootless wars as resembling those of Highland clans

[1] Plutarch, "Theseus" and "Solon."

or of Irish kings. Even for a deadly struggle against Xerxes they could hardly trust one another's aid in 480 B.C.; half a century later they were allying themselves against themselves with Persian satraps; and as mercenaries they served any master who would pay them. Treachery still characterised them in 415 B.C., when Alcibiades betrayed to Sparta the Athenian scheme for the conquest of Sicily.[1] The half-century that followed the defeat of Xerxes includes nearly all the great names of the glorious period of Athenian prosperity—the age of Pericles, when Homer was studied, and when philosophy and the drama flourished. After this came plague and war, the capture of Athens by the Spartans, the days when the mob laughed with Aristophanes, and poisoned Socrates—denounced, like others before him, as an atheist, because he did not credit the savage mythology of the Homeric poems. Themistocles had taught the hardy Greek sailors that those "whose navies hold the sluices of the sea" (as Andrew Marvel sang) are masters also of the land, and Mardonius fell fighting at Platæa after the Phœnician navy of his master, Xerxes, was scattered. But though Persia failed to reduce Greece to a province, the Persian diplomacy guarded her empire for a century and a half. Agesilaos of Sparta, invading Asia Minor for six years, might have rivalled Alexander; but the gold of Pharnabasus bribed Argos, Athens, Corinth, and Thebes against him, and led to the disgraceful peace of Antalkidas in 387 B.C. The Persian alliance with Sparta, a quarter of a century earlier, had been equally fatal to Athens, when her power was supreme. Like the Hebrews, the Greeks were the inhabitants of a small country, and they played only a minor part in history before 500 B.C. But, like the Hebrews also, they have conquered the world by the power of their highest

[1] Thucydides, vi. 90, 91.

thought. The ordinary Athenian hated philosophy and science, which—like the Englishman of half a century ago—he thought subversive of religion. The men whom Greece persecuted and exiled were those on whom her fame now rests. The eager minds of her great thinkers were not content with the vague ideas of older Asiatics, and their inquiries into nature laid the basis of modern science, and permeated the thought of Asia and Europe from India to Rome.

But it was not till the Macedonians conquered Greece that the extension of her influence began to be felt, after Alexander had captured the whole Persian empire by military genius, and by a statesmanship which he owed to the intelligence of his father in selecting Aristotle as a tutor for his son. The long spears of the Greeks had defended Thermopylæ; the yet longer *sarissa* of the Macedonian phalanx, and the long lance of their cavalry, secured victory against the cumbersome chariots and elephants of Darius. The courage of the deep-drinking Macedonians, the audacity and rapidity of their great leader, and the tolerance of his rule, won empire in four great battles, and preserved it for more than a century. It was then that the influence of Greek art, drama, poetry, and philosophy, spread far and wide in Egypt, Syria, Parthia, and the Panjāb.

The premature death of Alexander at Babylon, in 323 B.C., was followed by twenty years of confusion among seventeen provincial rulers, till these were reduced to four after the battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C. Ptolemy in Egypt and Syria, and Seleucus at Babylon, were worthy successors of their great master, and a brilliant Greek century in Egypt lasted till the death of Ptolemy III. in 222 B.C. But the old Greek spirit of dissension brought an age of futile wars after the murder of Seleucus in 280 B.C.; and thirty years later

Bactria and Persia became free. Rome was the protector of Egypt after 205 B.C., and defeated the last of the great Seleucidæ (Antiochus III.) fifteen years later. The ruin brought on Asia by the Greeks led the subject races to look with hope towards the new conquerors of Carthage, and even Judas Maccabæus, in 168 B.C., after freeing Palestine from the tyranny of Antiochus IV. made a treaty with Rome.

The number of the Macedonians led into Asia by Alexander had never been large, and it was his policy to intermarry Greeks and Persians, although under the first Ptolemy the Macedonians of the Fayyum colony brought their wives with them to Egypt.[1] The mixed Greco-Persian race which ruled to the borders of India, and sometimes also in the Panjāb, retained its Greek civilisation for nearly four centuries after Alexander's retreat; and even the Tartar kings of North-West India—the Kushans—inscribed their coins in Greek yet later. The Saka (or Scythian) satraps of Taxila, east of the Indus, were apparently subject to the Parthians, and after 190 B.C. the Bactrian coins bear native Indian legends on the reverse of the Greek medal. But the Parthians themselves retained Greek civilisation as late as the time when the head of the miserable Crassus (in 53 B.C.) was brought before Orodes, while witnessing a performance of the "Bacchæ" of Euripides; and Parthian coins also bear Greek legends. The architecture of North-West India was influenced by Greek art; the Hindu Zodiac is of Greek origin; and it seems probable that Hindu philosophy was equally indebted to the Platonism of the Bactrian Greeks. Mithradates I. (174 to 136 B.C.) was a "king of kings" from India to Armenia; and the new kingdom of Pontus spread Persian influence once more to the shores

[1] Mahaffy, "The Silver Age of the Greek World," 1906, p. 42.

of the Ægean, and cost the Romans, for twenty-five years, far greater trouble than did the degenerate Greeks, till Pompey reached the Caucasus.

To this later age belong the remarkable monuments of the Nimrud Dagh in Commagene,[1] which bear witness to the Persian influence over the degenerate scion of the Seleucidæ who submitted to Pompey in 65 B.C. He calls himself in his long Greek inscriptions, accompanying gigantic statues of his gods, "the great king Antiochus Theos, lover of Rome, lover of Greece." He identifies Greek gods with those of Persia,[2] and the art of his bas-reliefs shows the same curious mixture of late Greek and Persian styles.

Such was the Asiatic world when Rome began first to meddle in its affairs. The Roman era was nearly the same as that of Greece.[3] The Roman civilisation, her arts, alphabets, weights and measures, came from the two sources—Etruscan and Greek—which formed the early Italian population. The Roman mixed race sprang from Latins, Sabines and Etruscans, and was characterised on the one hand by the Aryan love of self-government and of freedom, and steadied on the other by the Turanian practical stolidity, and love of law. Of the seven centuries preceding Augustus two and a half passed under the rule of tribal kings, Sabine, Latin, and Etruscan, and a hundred and fifty years in sturdy struggles to create a constitution, to repel Gauls on the north and Greco-Italians on the south. The conquest of Italy was effected in the next eighty years, and then, for another century and a half, Rome was engaged in the great struggle with Carthage which, beginning as a fight for freedom, developed finally into a wider policy which made the

[1] Humann and Puchstein, "Reisen," 1890, p. 280.

[2] Zeus with Ahura-mazda, Apollo with Mithra, and Herakles with Verethragna.

[3] Foundation of Rome, 753 B.C. (Varro); first Olympiad, 776 B.C.

Mediterranean an Italian lake. The mastery at sea, for which the Etruscan, the Phœnician, and the Greek alike had striven, was gained by a new and more masterful people. When Pyrrhus of Epirus (281 to 275 B.C.) was driven out of southern Italy in spite of his elephants, the Greek sea power decayed: when the jealous rulers of Carthage, after three centuries of struggle in Sicily, failed to support the mighty raid of Hannibal (lasting from 218 to 204 B.C.), the fate of the great Tyrian city in Africa was sealed; and the Romans, who had begun with only fifty ships, learning to ram the Carthaginian galleys and forming a sufficient fleet, left to Carthage only ten triremes when Scipio made the second peace, in 202 B.C.

But extension of power to foreign lands disorganised the old Roman constitution, and entailed on Italy the evils of civil war for ninety years. When the Cimbri slid down the Alps on their shields[1] Marius saved his country. When eighty thousand Roman citizens were slain by Mithradates of Pontus, Pompey's dictatorship in Asia became inevitable. But Marius and Sulla proved bloodthirsty tyrants; Pompey and Antony were as venal as Marlborough. Cæsar alone seems to have risen above the vulgar ambition of the ordinary general; but it was to the practical wisdom of Augustus that Rome owed two centuries of increasing prosperity and power, marred only by the evil days of Nero's reign.

Two ideals were then striving against each other in Italy, as they have continued ever since to struggle in Europe—the Aryan ideal of government by consent, and the Asiatic ideal of the priest-king or divine ruler. It was a general and sincere belief that genius and power marked the children of the gods. The Akkadian and Etruscan kings were priests: the Pharaohs, and the kings of Assyria, are addressed

[1] Plutarch, "Marius."

on the tablets as "my God": the heroes were born of divine fathers by human mothers; and such divine incarnations are still common in India. The emperors of China and Japan had been held to be of divine descent long before Augustus; to Alexander a like origin was ascribed, as well as to the Incas of Peru in later ages. Even the kings of Pessinus, and of Hittite Comana, were priests, and Antiochus of Commagene was enthroned among the great gods. So too Augustus[1] was to return to the heaven whence he came; and writing to the Cnidians he calls himself "Autocrator, Cæsar, son of God, Augustus the high priest."[2] But he was a statesman who combined both ideals in one, and who curbed alike the power of a plutocracy which grew out of the old Patrician order, the lawlessness of the Plebeians, and the insolence of the army; who gave over to the Senate every settled province, and only ruled by martial law the lands where wild tribes were yet untamed, or where the Semitic hatred of Rome still threatened trouble. Insane emperors like Caligula might insist on the Persian custom of kissing the monarch's foot; but the able rulers who maintained the traditions of Augustus, from Vespasian down to Marcus Aurelius, recognised that the imperator was only the "commander" of armies including most of the Roman citizens, whose right it was to elect the head of the state. The boundaries of the Empire, formed by the Euphrates and the Danube, the Rhine and the ocean, were the natural limits which, in the opinion of Augustus, sufficed to make Italy safe, and the only permanent addition was made when Britain was conquered for Domitian by Agricola. The early provincial rulers, of whom Cicero complains, were often greedy and unjust; but gradually the Romans

[1] See Horace, "Odes," I. ii. 45.

[2] Mahaffy, "Silver Age of the Greek World," 1906, p. 457.

learned the great art of tolerant rule, and the Roman peace descended on a war-worn world.

Already, however, under Augustus the seeds of internal decay had been sown which were to prove fatal to Italy five centuries later. The sturdy yeomanry, who had conquered every race they met except the Germans, were practically exiled to other lands. The veteran married and settled in a civil or military colony abroad, or came home to find his farm bought up by some Patrician plutocrat. Horace was the son of a freedman, and the owner of a farm. He foresaw the evils that must come when the vines and olives were replaced by turf, by flower gardens and ornamental grounds, as the villa extended and the "coloni" were evicted.[1] The Patrician may have been glad to see his turbulent Plebeian opponent employed abroad, and to substitute an army of slaves for the old yeomen; but Horace reminded him that it was not by such that victory was won in the days of "unshorn Cato," and he prepared a rod for his own back as surely as did the French nobles of later times. Sicily had been a rich corn land before the introduction of slave labour, but Strabo found it only a region of stock-breeders and shepherds; and in Greece also the spread of large properties led, in our first century, to the same ruin of agriculture, which was general in Italy after the fourth century.[2] The vigour of the race was transferred to the provinces; and the ruling class was ruined by vulgar and material luxury, till they no more produced statesmen, but only gamblers, horse-racers, quail-fighters, and feasters whose obscene talk and licentious deeds were not even concealed from their young children: too proud to trade, too indolent to undertake the hardships of war, they were yet not above enriching themselves by corruption and

[1] Horace, "Odes," II. xv., xviii.

[2] Mahaffy, "Silver Age," pp. 256, 298: see Gibbon, chap. xvii.

usury. In time they found no defenders, when the bulk of the population consisted of Greek, Syrian, or Gaulish slaves, working in chains and sleeping in dungeons, hating the master who perhaps owned twenty thousand of such human cattle, who had sometimes been free princes at home, and whose condition was far beneath that of the slave in Babylon six centuries earlier. Hadrian and the Antonines strove to protect them by law, but nothing could replace the old native yeomen who loved their country. The lower class, untaxed in Italy, living on the corn[1] tribute of Egypt, with free rations of bread and wine, but without land or employment, caring only, even under Augustus, for "bread and games," were mingled with the scum of Asia—the Chaldean soothsayer, the Jewish pedlar, and the Syrian usurer—in the hovels of crowded Rome. Their lawless clamour demanded from the rich a "munificence" shown by public spectacles, and donations, which in time became so ruinous that men were condemned to public office in revenge by their enemies. The ancient piety was in a measure restored by Augustus, who found crumbling temples and smoke-begrimed statues, and is said to have rebuilt more than three hundred of such fanes.[2] But Roman superstition was savage and degrading, and with it mingled all the new rites of Egypt and Asia Minor, and all the most archaic beliefs of Asiatic magicians. Intense ignorance pervaded every class, and the average Roman hated philosophy as much as the average Athenian.

The Roman thought of the Greeks much as the Saxon thinks of the Kelts. He regarded them as

[1] These rations were evolved from the old law of Caius Gracchus (630 B.C.): see Lecky, "European Morals," 11th edit., ii. p. 74.

[2] Horace, "Odes," III. ii. 30, vi. 1–47; Vergil, "Æneid," vi. 716; Ovid, "Fasti," ii. 63.

clever, but quite unreliable. Cicero called them liars, but we may well doubt if the Romans were really more truthful, though they prided themselves on "seriousness," and condemned Greek "levity." Vergil represents all that is most worthy in Roman manners, and describes a rural life such as survives almost unchanged in Italy to-day; but what are we to think of the dark figures of Gyges and Ligurinus in Horace[1]? The vice of Rome was as vile as that of any Eastern city, though the Romans may have been no worse than the older nations in morals. Roman cruelty was perhaps not as savage as that of the Assyrians, and even Darius delights in relating how he put out the eyes of his enemies and mutilated them; but torture at trials was not an invention of the middle ages, as we see from the horrible Roman *Equuleus* or "pony."[2] Crucifixion had long been a punishment among Greeks, Carthaginians, and Jews alike; but the Romans impaled men like the Assyrians. Human sacrifice continued to be common even after 240 B.C., and was not put down till Trajan's time.[3] It remained a Semitic practice till 400 A.D., though Asoka had forbidden even the sacrifice of beasts in India two centuries before Augustus. The fiendish tortures inflicted by Christian emperors of Byzantium exceeded anything that is recorded of Tiberius or of Herod.

We are accustomed to speak of Rome as ruling all the civilised world; but her real mission was to introduce the elements of civilisation among wild tribes in Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain. In Asia she did little more than keep the peace among races of culture

[1] Horace, "Odes," II. v. 20, IV. i. 33, x. 5.

[2] See illustration in Rich., "Dict.," *s.v.* p. 265, 3rd edit. 1873. He quotes Cicero, "Mil.," 21, and Quint. Curt., vi. 10.

[3] Plutarch, "Marcellus"; Renan, "Église Chrétienne," p. 3, 1879.

equal or superior to her own. She imposed the Latin language on the West, but in the East Greek remained dominant. The great decrees of Augustus at Angora are in both languages; but, except on milestones and beside roads, Latin texts are few in Asia as compared with Greek. Romans even inscribed their tombstones in the latter language, which, all over the civilised provinces of the empire, remained (like Latin in the middle ages) the common tongue for literature, science, and diplomacy. The Roman Empire covered a million and a half of square miles. In six weeks from Rome Britain could be reached, in six days by sea Alexandria, and thence in forty days southern India. The density of population was a third of that of modern Europe. But the Persian Empire was larger than the Roman, and its Greco-Parthian civilisation was quite as advanced as that of the West. The contemporary Empire of China was immensely more extensive than either of the others, and in art, philosophy, and organisation it was perhaps more civilised.

The enmity between Rome and the Semitic race was undying. Jerusalem met the fate of Carthage, but Arabia remained unconquered, and the Arabs were the great traders of the empire, extending their influence to Numidia on the west, and to India on the east.[1] Roman gold coins of Tiberius and Nero are so numerous in southern India that one find, on the Malabar coast, amounted to five coolie loads; and small copper coins down to 400 A.D. are so common as to suggest a Roman settlement. This gold poured in to purchase silks and spices, gems, pepper, and dyed stuffs; and at Angora Augustus records the embassies sent by Indian kings of whom the Romans had never

[1] For the derivation of the Numidian alphabet see my "First Bible," p. 9. See also Vincent Smith, "Early History of India," pp. 221, 337.

heard before. One of these came by sea from the South, another was sent to Trajan, after 99 A.D., by the Tartar ruler of the north-west—Kadphises II. The wealth of Rome in our second century must have exceeded that of Persia under Xerxes.

But this material prosperity was not accompanied by exceptional culture among Romans. They were great road-makers, and erected fine bridges, though they do not seem to have known that water will run uphill in a pipe, and so wasted much money on their aqueducts. They copied Greek art rather clumsily; and the great cities which sprang up in Asia under Hadrian and his successors—such as Gerasa, Baalbek, and Palmyra, in Syria—are Greek rather than Roman. Augustus boasted that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble; but the cities of the West, as a rule, were small and mean, compared with those of Egypt, Asia, and Africa, where Greek, Punic, and Persian civilisations were already ancient. The Roman who did not know Greek got his ideas of philosophy from Cicero for the Platonic, Lucretius for the Epicurean, and Seneca for the Stoic systems. But the Roman mind was not speculative, and Latin literature includes only a few great names, together with those of a host of bad and degrading authors. We should not now allow an epitaph to be set up which said, "baths, wine, and women, spoil our lives, but make up life"; yet it was very true of Rome as a whole.[1] The Romans never understood Epikouros, though Stoic ethics were accepted by their best emperors. They were attracted by the mysticism of the East, and they believed in Chaldean amulets and Babylonian fortune-tellers,[2] but they contributed little that was new to the higher thought of the world—their delight was rather in the

[1] Bigg, "The Church's Task under the Roman Empire," 1905, p. 97, quoting "Corp. Inscript. Lat.," vi. 3, 15258.

[2] Plutarch, "Marius"; Horace, "Odes," I. xi. 2.

slaughter of the arena, and the fights of gladiators, unknown to Greeks.

After the death of Marcus Aurelius the decay of Rome began to be evident, under Commodus, in 180 A.D. The provinces began to feel their own power. The rich Roman hated to travel and to put up at wretched extortionate inns. It was no light task to visit all the frontiers, and to keep in touch with the legions, as emperors were bound to do. Hence, after Pertinax was killed, in 193 A.D., few emperors came from Rome. Septimius Severus was a native of Africa, wedded to a Syrian, and to her were related his successors, including the high priest of Ela-gabal ("the mountain god") at Emesa, and his cousin Alexander Severus, born at Arca in Phœnicia. Maximin was a Gothic giant; Philip Arabs came from Bostra, in Bashan: Claudius II., Aurelian, and Probus were Illyrians; Diocletian was a Dalmatian, and Constantius a Dacian. Gallienus, in 253 A.D., took as his colleague Odenathus of Palmyra, who had repulsed the Parthians, and whose widow, Zenobia, for a few years (267 to 273 A.D.) was queen of western Asia from Bithynia to Egypt: she seemed destined to restore the Semitic empire till Aurelian defeated her. Eastern fashions began to prevail even in the West, and Diocletian's court—where prostration before the emperor was ordained—was no longer Roman. Men began to ask why Italy, which did nothing for the provinces, should live at their expense, and why Palmyrene archers must serve at North Shields, even if married to British wives[1] (as a well-known text records), in order that Rome might exact tribute of all the West. The old danger of army tyranny—against which since Cromwell's time we have so jealously guarded the state—was never quite overcome by the Romans; and constant wars of succession

[1] "Trans. Bib. Arch. Soc.," vi. p. 436.

among emperors chosen by the legions in far lands, or buying their title from the insolent Pretorians at home, suggested that the hereditary principle—so odious to Romans—was better for the world than contested elections. Diocletian endeavoured to establish a compromise by which two Augusti—in East and West—should always be succeeded by two Cæsars, trained by themselves in statesmanship. Constantine more boldly adopted the hereditary principle; but to carry out successfully such a revolution it was first necessary to remove the capital from Rome. The change had been dreaded ever since the time of Cæsar, but the consequences were not foreseen. The master of Byzantium has never long been the master of a great empire; and though the position of the city, as the key to the East, was important, the interests of Rome itself led to the division of the empire on Constantine's death, and East and West insensibly drew apart and became once more rivals. The old Consular authority became an empty name: a new religion—that of the most powerful Church of the age—was established for purely political reasons; and while the Eastern Empire became an ordinary Oriental tyranny, the Western Empire was ruined by events over which Rome had no control. Italy was forced to look for a protector in future to the barbarians whom she had civilised. Her work in Asia was done; but, in the West, she still remained—even in her humiliation—the one representative of civilisation for another five hundred years.

ii. **Mediæval History, 300-1500 A.D.**—To the summertime of the second century of our era the storms of the fourth and fifth centuries succeeded, and both Europe and Asia, for a thousand years, were shaken by the great racial movements of the dark ages.

Mediæval history covers less than half the duration of the ancient ages of civilisation, but its changes were more rapid and its development more complex. The old culture had to be transmitted to new and vigorous races before a further advance in the progress of the world in general became possible. The barbarian flood covered the settled lands of the south, and swept away the corrupt and effete races of Italy and Greece. Huns, Goths, Arabs, and Turks, were in turn the ministers of wrath before a new and wider civilisation rose from the ruins of the past. The old systems might, however, have long lingered but for events which no statesman could have foreseen, due to natural causes over which they had no control—to the teeming of hardy stocks in barren lands, and to the rise of a powerful empire in China. Constantine's bold effort to reconstitute the Roman state in accordance with the conditions of his age produced no permanent effects. Seventy years after the foundation of his new capital the sons of the fanatical Spanish emperor Theodosius divided the heritage, and while the East was retained by the elder brother, Arcadius, the West fell to the younger, Honorius, but was only retained by his successors for eighty years. The power of Byzantium, gradually decaying in Europe, was preserved by transmission to rulers who were of Gothic or of Persian and Armenian origin, until destroyed after three centuries from its foundation by Arabs and Turks.

These great revolutions were due to causes which we trace back to the second century B.C., when the Huns in Mongolia, north of China, were repelled by the Han emperor Wu-Ti. They were driven to the west, and drove before them the Tartars of Turkestan, who were pressed south to India and west towards Russia. The Hans followed them in 73 A.D., and extended the Chinese Empire to the Caspian, but in

the second century the Huns subdued the Turkish tribes of Central Asia, and gradually formed a confederation, which grew into a Mongol empire larger than that of Rome, but extending over less fertile lands. By 376 A.D. they had subdued the Khozar Turks on the Volga, and had driven the Goths from Hungary; and at the close of the fourth century they were ravaging Armenia and Persia. The White Huns fixed their capital at Herat, and penetrated into India nearly to Patna. They attained their greatest expansion under the terrible Attila—who is described as purely Mongol in personal type—ruling from the borders of China to the Rhine, and from Armenia to the Baltic, and fixing his new capital near Tokay, in Hungary.

It was not the policy of Attila to destroy the great trade which enriched Europe and Asia in his days, and his hardy horsemen were indeed not fitted to undertake the siege of walled cities protected by Roman engines of war. He was content to take tribute of Constantinople and of Rome, and to spread the terror of his name to Antioch, and even to Egypt. The civilisation of the Huns was primitive, and the spoils which they took from civilised lands formed a strange contrast with the wooden houses in which they dwelt. Attila allied himself with the Vandals of Africa, and endeavoured to form a marriage alliance with the proud but effete successor of Constantine in Italy. He reserved his main effort for the conquest of France, and after his defeat at Chalons, in 451 A.D., following the unsuccessful siege of Orleans, his power waned, and his empire crumbled at his death. In the East the Huns, who had destroyed the great Gupta dynasty of Patna, were finally subdued by the alliance of Persians and Turks in 565 A.D. In the west they were driven out of Hungary by the Gothic Gepidæ as early as 495 A.D.

But though the Mongols and Turks failed to establish themselves as rulers of the West, the Turanian expansion into South Russia was permanent for a thousand years. The Uigur Turks, from the south of Lake Balkash, ruled along the Oxus in the sixth century, and by 1000 A.D. they had adopted an alphabet of Persian origin which spread to Siberia and Manchuria: they had been influenced by the Buddhist thought of India as well as by Islam and by Nestorian Christianity.[1] The Avars, who were a branch of the same race, succeeded the Huns at Tokay, and in 610 A.D. besieged Constantinople. They were not finally driven back till Charlemagne defeated them in 796 A.D. Within a century they were replaced by Hungarians, who crossed the Volga in 884 A.D., and continued to trouble Europe till subdued by Otho I. in 934 A.D., when they settled down in Hungary, and became Christians soon after. The Khozars, whose capital was on the Volga, are said to have been ruled by Jewish kings after the conversion of their chief by Isaac of Sinjar in 740 A.D. and the Arab writers of the tenth century describe the strange mixture of races and religions in this region, to which the oppressed fled from Persians and Moslems.[2] The Khitai, and other Turkish peoples of Eastern Turkestan, were also civilised by India and Persia. The Chinese were determined to retain the great trade route by which their silk was carried to Constantinople and Rome, and which led from Antioch through Persia and Kashgar. Tai-tsong, the second Tang emperor, subjected the Turks in 630 A.D.; and, in spite of the Moslems, Afghanistan was a Chinese province as late as 747 A.D., when the Khitai began to invade China proper, followed by Kin Tartars in 1114 A.D., and thus

[1] Vámbéry, "History of Bokhara," 1873, p. 73; Taylor, "Alphabet," i. p. 300.

[2] Carmoly, "Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte," 1847, pp. 1-110.

preparing the way for the great Mongol conquerors of our thirteenth century. Europe knew little of this Turanian civilisation in Asia, which finally rivalled her own, and Huns and Turks were judged by the savage cruelty of their fighting men, and as enemies of the Christian faith.

Mongol expansion was thus the main cause of the destruction of the Roman Empire in the West. The enemies against whom the Romans had successfully fought were of Keltic race, from the time when the first Brennus sacked Rome, in 390 B.C., to that of the second Brennus, who invaded Macedon and Greece, and was repulsed by Antiochus I., and whose kinsmen the Romans found settled in Galatia. The Cimbri, who reached Gaul by 500 B.C., were driven from Italy by Marius in 101 B.C., and subjugated later by Cæsar. The Teutonic tribes only became formidable to the empire when they were driven from their homes by the Huns.

The Goths, like the Huns, are described as barbarians by Roman writers, being enemies of the Catholic Church; but their civilisation, which was of Greek origin, may have been of considerable antiquity. The Greek traders of Olbia (near Kiev) penetrated up the Dniester river at least as early as the time when Greeks from Sinope were sent by Mithradates of Pontus to the Crimea[1]; and the "runes" of the Goths were the letters of the Greek alphabet. Gothic art spread north even to Scandinavia, and was brought west by the Danes even to Ireland, where the Greek origin of Danish ornaments is distinguishable still, as well as in the Orkneys. The Goths became Arian Christians in the fourth century, and Byzantine influence on the Eastern Teutons continued long after, so that even in the later middle ages the coinage

[1] Mahaffy, "Silver Age," p. 113.

[2] Gibbon, chap. x., xi., xxvi., xxx.

of East Europe is based not on a Roman, but on a Greek unit. Swarming south from Prussia, the Goths, who defeated Decius in the third century A.D., had fleets of ships which sailed to the east shores of the Black Sea, and down the Ægean, from the Danube. They invaded Athens, and they destroyed the temple of Ephesus, but when they were settled—by agreement with Aurelian—on the north bank of the great river, they became faithful allies who formed a strong barrier against the inroads of wilder Teutonic tribes on their north. In the latter part of the fourth century they suffered cruelly, when they were obliged to seek shelter south of the Danube, until Theodosius settled them in Thrace, Phrygia, and Lydia. On his death (in 395 A.D.) they revolted under Alaric, who had received a Byzantine education, and whom Arcadius was forced to recognise as master general of Eastern Illyricum. The weakness of the empire was evident to one who had, from youth, dwelt in its capital; and Alaric, crossing the icebound Danube to demand payment of the subsidy accorded by Theodosius, held Athens to ransom, and might have taken Constantinople but for Roman aid. Pressing west after this check, he conquered Aquitaine, and his mixed horde of Huns and Goths finally sacked Rome in 410 A.D. Britain, cut off and abandoned, fell a prey to pagan Saxons forty years later, and no sooner did the news of the great catastrophe spread over Gaul than the wilder pagan Teutons poured over the Rhine as Franks, Germans, Burgundians, and Suevi.

The Vandals were cousins of the Goths and Arian Christians. They swarmed into Spain, and within twenty years had established themselves in Carthage, so that Rome was surrounded by her foes. The rich defenceless city was again sacked by the Vandal pirates under Genseric in 455 A.D., and yet a third time by Ricimer in 472 A.D. Four years later Odoacer

became the first Gothic king of Italy, and a second swarm of East Goths, conquered in turn under Theodoric twenty years after.

Yet, while Rome itself was ruined, Italy generally prospered under the just Gothic rule[1] in the fifth century, though the Catholic Church was only tolerated, and the Latin civilisation despised; for agriculture revived when the Patricians and their slaves were replaced by the hardy soldiers to whom lands were assigned. The conquests of the Franks, under the converted Clovis, also drove the West Goths to Spain, and laid the foundation of a later civilisation in the peninsula. It was indeed an evil and a corrupt plutocracy which Alaric destroyed. The rich Romans (as described by Ammianus Marcellinus) were clothed in embroidered robes of silk and purple: they drove in their carriages surrounded by slaves who kissed their knees, and under the shade of gilded umbrellas like the Persians. They busied themselves in gaming and hunting, they read only the satires of Juvenal. They were usurers who cast their wretched creditors into prison; nominal Christians who believed only in witchcraft and astrology, and who in their extremity trusted in sacrifices and spells. A population of more than three hundred thousand was crowded into the splendid city built by the Romans three centuries before, and of these forty thousand were slaves, who at length wreaked their vengeance on their masters. Plague, famine, and rapine, decimated Rome, and she sank to the lowest ebb of her fortunes, while the Gothic capital was still established at Ravenna.

But Gothic success was not confined to the West. Constantinople was surrounded by a settled Gothic population in both Europe and Asia. It was natural, therefore, that her ruler also should be at length a

[1] Gibbon, chap. xxxix.

Goth. Justinian is regarded as the last great Roman emperor, but he was descended from a Gothic family in Thrace. The languages of his court were Latin and Greek, but his subjects were Goths, Armenians, Persians, Turks, Syrians, and Egyptians. He suppressed the schools of Athens, and the consulship in Rome. His laws were admired by those who had never heard of 'Ammurabi, or of Asoka, but they are often the laws of an ignorant, corrupt, and barbarous age—though they formed the foundation of later European law in the West. The civilisation of the provincial emperors had been inferior to that of the best Roman age. The architecture and the coinage of Constantine were both very inferior in art to the works of the Antonines. With Justinian we find fully developed that stiff and conventional style which we call Byzantine—as primitive as that of the Hittites, or of Saxons and Franks in the dark ages. The buildings of Justinian—such as the Golden Gate at Jerusalem—are often massive, though the ornament is debased in style and over-elaborate. The Hagia Sophia makes us giddy by its size, as we gaze from its galleries at the mighty dome; but it has not the sincerity and solidity of the huge masonry of Baalbek. The brick walls are covered with marbles, shamming Roman realities: the tracery mingles Persian types with debased Greek art; and, like the work of Norman cathedrals, it denotes the shallowness which characterised Gothic civilisation. Justinian himself was a great ruler, who not only drove the Goths from Italy and the Vandals from Carthage, but also allied himself with the Turks on the north-east, and the Christian Abyssinians south of Egypt, to keep the Persians—under his great Sassanian contemporary Chosroes Nushirvan—in check. He ruled from the Caucasus to Rome, and from the Danube to Egypt. He brought the silkworm to Syria, and reopened the

sea route from Alexandria to India and China; but his empire was dissolved in a century, and the later rulers of Byzantium—after the Persian and the Arab conquered Asia—were no longer of either Roman, Greek, or Gothic derivation. Leo the Isaurian, in the eighth century, belonged to the Persian stock of Cappadocia. The so-called Macedonian emperors traced descent from Parthian Arsacidæ. John Zimisces was an Armenian. Justinian II. had a Khozar wife, as also had Leo IV., whose son, Constantine VI., was thus half a Turk. The civilisation of Byzantium became more and more Oriental, and its government a very evil Oriental despotism, till the Comneni, who claimed Roman origin, restored some measure of prosperity, and a civilisation seeking alliance for a quarter of a century with the new Europe of the Normans.

In Italy the conquests of Justinian were partly lost four years after his death; and the Lombards—akin to the Goths—divided the peninsula with the Greek exarchs of Ravenna for nearly two centuries, during which the Catholics were forced to rely on the detested Byzantines, and the Romans on their bishops, who gradually assumed temporal power over the estates of the Church. The final success of that Church was due to the zeal of her missionaries among the wild Franks, and to the Catholic convictions of Pepin, when he founded the new empire at Cologne, and freed Italy from the Lombards after their defeat of the exarchs. The Popes were glad to submit to his great son; the privileges conferred by Charlemagne restored Roman Catholic power, and led immediately to their schism with the Greeks. But the degradation of the Church, under bishops nominated by Charlemagne's successors, continued till the reformation which Hildebrand effected when he set free the Roman Church from the dominance

of German emperors by alliance with the Norman princes of Southern Italy.

While Roman civilisation, thus overwhelmed, slowly created a new Europe in the ages of Gothic ignorance, Asia enjoyed a culture and prosperity greater than she had ever known before. The storms which swept west from the Gobi deserts were followed by those which swept north from the barren lands of Arabia. The Yemen and the Hejaz, which had resisted Rome, were conquered by Persia, and in the "year of the elephant" (570 A.D.), when Muhammad was born, the Christian king of Abyssinia raided as far as Mecca. Thus for several centuries Arabia had been under foreign influences, and it was filled with Jewish traders. Persian legends were well known to the opponents of the new prophet, Gnostic Christians had fled from the Catholics of Syria and Chaldea; and the more educated Arabs (called *Hanifi* or "converts") were dissatisfied with the barbarous superstitions of their own race. Asia, indeed, had long been striving to reconcile the ideas of rival faiths, and found expression at length in the simple cry, "There is but one God, and Muhammad is His messenger." The personal influence of the Prophet depended on a character which represented the very ideal of the free Semitic races from the time of Job. His faithfulness and piety, his modesty and kindliness, his fervid eloquence and sincere belief in his own inspiration, were equally admirable in the eyes of all Arabs. He alone could unite the jealous tribes, and inspire them with a zeal and hope of Paradise which made them careless of death. Mecca was forced to submit, in 630 A.D., to the exile she had driven forth eight years before; for the guardians of the Ka'aba were starved into obedience when their trade with the north was cut off, and lost all their influence when the red sandstone idol of Hobal fell, scattering the arrows

of fate from its golden hand, after the black-robed Moslems had solemnly danced round the square shrine, whose red veil—swayed by the breath of the jinns—remained unrent, and no thunderbolt from heaven fell on the great iconoclast. In that same year the Christians were prostrating themselves before the recovered cross in Jerusalem. The Buddhists, like them, were adoring the relics and footprints of a deified master, the Jews and Persians were sunk in formalism, and Byzantine Christianity had become a scandal to the world. Muhammad knew well the corruption of Syrian and Persian faiths, and he proclaimed a religion which—as he said—had been that of all true prophets since the beginning of time. He lived only two years after his triumph, to see Arabia united under him, and to bless the Moslem leaders who were about to conquer the Byzantines in Syria.

The conquests of the Moslems were more rapid than those of the Goths, for the Byzantines and Persians had been alike weakened by luxury and by wars between themselves. Muhammad had watched them, and rightly predicted the victories of Heraclius,[1] if we may trust the present text of the Korān. Four years after the Prophet's death the Sassanian power was wrecked at Kadasiah; and the Moslem forces, which overran Syria as far as Laodicea, retreating before Heraclius, at length were able to show on the banks of the Yermūk—south-east of the Sea of Galilee—that they were invincible even by the so-called Romans. The daring march of Khaled over the Syrian desert to join the western army turned the day in favour of Islam, and Jerusalem capitulated to Omar in 637 A.D. Egypt was conquered a year later; Kairwān was founded in 647 A.D.; Carthage fell half a century later; and Spain was conquered

[1] Korān, xxx. 1.

from the Goths by 714 A.D. On the north the Arab fleets raided Cyprus, Rhodes, and the Greek islands, and the Arabs twice attempted to take Constantinople, in 668 and 716 A.D. On the east they reached Bactria, and raided India in 710 A.D. But here they were opposed, as early as 664 A.D., by successors of Harsha, the great descendant of the Guptas; and on the west a limit was placed on their expansion by their defeat in 732 A.D. at Tours, when Charles Martell became the hero of Christendom. All their greatest victories were won under the hereditary Khalifs of Damascus, descendants of the elder branch of the Koreish, who became supreme after 'Ali, the fourth Khalif, had been murdered by the Khareji (or "anarchists"), and his son had abdicated in 661 A.D. The first enthusiasm died out as this Ommeya house decayed; and when it was succeeded by the descendants of 'Abbas, the Prophet's uncle, in 750 A.D., Spain at once threw off allegiance to the Khalif of Baghdad, and was soon imitated by the governors of Morocco and of Kairwan, while the Fatemites—claiming descent from Muhammad's daughter—became independent in Egypt in 916 A.D. Meantime the African Moslems attacked Sicily and the Mediterranean islands in 730 A.D., and established themselves at Bari, in Italy. In 846 they appeared on the Tiber, and they were not finally expelled from the mainland till Italy, Germany, and Greece united against them in 890, and a Greek Katapan (or "plenipotentiary") replaced them at Bari.

When we stand in the beautiful chapel of the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem we seem to see an epitome of the great age of Arab civilisation, lasting from the seventh to the ninth centuries of our era. It was completed in the seventy-second year after the Hejirah (692 A.D.) by 'Abd el Melek, the fourth Khalif of Damascus. The date is recorded in gold mosaic letters

on a blue ground above the arches of its octagonal arcade. The alphabet in use (commonly called Kufic) was that of the Arab Christians of Bashan before the Moslem invasion,[1] and was derived from the Palmyrene script of the third century. The supporting pillars of this arcade were torn from some Christian church, together with those of the inner circle supporting the dome. To this building the outer wall, with its Persian parapet of round arches resting on coupled dwarf pillars, was added by the great Abbaside Khalif el Mamun in 831 A.D., according to the date on the fine bronze gates. The wooden painted dome, destroyed by earthquake, was restored (as its texts record) in 1022, and now bears also the name and titles of Saladin. The iron grille reminds us of a century of Norman conquest: the beautiful Persian tiles, and the coloured glass windows, tell of yet later renovations by Moslems down to our fifteenth century. But the most interesting feature of the texts is the appearance of extracts from the Korān, dating from the first foundation of the building; and no other faith can show monumental records of its scriptures so nearly approaching the original date of composition. These declare the belief of Muhammad that Jesus was the Word of God; but the expression "Messiah," found in the present text of the Korān, is omitted.[2]

The Arabs had little native civilisation, though they could write more than a thousand years before Muhammad. The first Khalifs were simple in dress and frugal in diet, and under the Damascus Khalifs

[1] See Waddington, "Inscriptions Grecques et Latines," No. 2464: Arab text on a chapel of John the Baptist at Harrān, south of Damascus, with a date equivalent to 568 A.D.

[2] Sura, xvii. 111, xix. 34-37, lvii. 2, iv. 168, 169. The latter reads: "Jesus son of Mary is an apostle of God, and His Word which he conveyed into Mary, and a Spirit from Himself."

the Moslems still remained intent on the study of the Korān alone. But, gradually, they adopted the culture of Syria and Persia, and employed Christian Greeks to build for them, while their earliest coins—inscribed in Kufic—have a very Byzantine character. The distinctive Saracenic style developed from that of Sassanian Persia, as is very plain when we compare the Dome of the Rock, or the beautiful kiosque at 'Amman in Gilead, with earlier Persian buildings. Under the Abbasides, as the Moslems became acquainted with the science and philosophy of Greece (preserved by the Asiatic Christians), and with the mysticism of India, the old zeal and orthodoxy decayed, and with it the old enthusiasm for conquest. But if we compare the court of Harūn-er-Rashid with that of his great contemporary Charlemagne, or recall the astronomy, botany, mathematics, geography, and medicine, the poetry and philosophy of the palmy days of El Mamūn, we have to confess that the Emperor of the West—though he brought Alcuin from England to his court—was little better than an illiterate barbarian, who was busy for thirty years fighting pagan Saxons and putting down human sacrifices.

The Arabs in the ages of their power continued to be great travellers, and traders with the East. Mas'ûdi, about 943 A.D., visited Multan, Ceylon, and Madagascar from Baghdad. Yākūt in the thirteenth century described countries between Bactria and Spain. The ubiquitous Ibn Batuta was to outrival them all in the middle of the fourteenth Christian century, travelling in Afghanistan and Russia, in India to Delhi, by sea to the Maldives, Ceylon, Sumatra, and China, and in the West to Morocco, Spain, and Timbuctoo, which had just been conquered by the Arabs. The Arab trade in the Indian Ocean dated from the Ptolemaic age, long before the caravans of Palmyra crossed the

Euphrates.[1] Hippalus is said to have discovered the monsoon in the time of Augustus, and Ibn Khordādbih knew of the two monsoons in our ninth century; while Cosmas in the time of Justinian describes the old land route to India, as well as that by sea. In 336 A.D. another Indian embassy bore gems and strange beasts to Constantinople. The Arabs visited Canton in the eighth century, and down to 1086 A.D. In the twelfth century there were Chinese junks in the Red Sea, and Chinese porcelain in Syria; but Indian wares were common in Egypt as early as 375 A.D.[2] Nestorian Christians were found in Ceylon in the sixth century, in China as early as 636 A.D., and (as recorded in the Singanfu tablet) they were still there in 781 A.D. It was by their aid that Justinian brought the silkworms to the West. We no longer wonder at the travels of Marco Polo, who returned from Canton in 1292 A.D. by the sea route, past Tonquin, Malacca, Sumatra, Ceylon, the Nicobar and Maldive Islands.[3]

The decay of Arab civilisation was due to the conversion of the Turks, whose power rapidly increased in the ninth century. In the eleventh, under Mahmūd of Ghuzni, they carried the faith of Islam into the Panjāb; and the family of Seljuk—trained under this warrior—became the protectors of the Arab Khalifs of Baghdad, and under Alp Arslan they wrested Asia Minor from the Byzantines. His son Melek Shah became the founder of a Turkish empire embracing yet wider limits in Asia than that of the Persians under Darius. But these new converts were neither

[1] Palmyrene caravans are recorded in 142 A.D.—Waddington, "Inscriptions Grecques et Latines," No. 2589.

[2] Epiphanius, "Hæres," xlvi.

[3] Even as early as 20 B.C. Diodorus knew of an alphabet in Ceylon written vertically like the Chinese and the Mongolian.—Diodorus, II. iv.

as highly educated nor as tolerant as the Arabs, among whom secret scepticism had long been spreading, whereas the Turks were fanatical Moslems. Hence after the capture of Jerusalem in 1077 the Eastern Christians and the Western pilgrims suffered a persecution unknown before, and the trade of the Lombard republics and of the merchants of Amalfi was obstructed. Turkish power was a very imminent danger to Europe, and while it brought misery on Asia it obliged the West once more to unite its forces to protect Mediterranean commerce by the conquest of Syria, with results little expected by the Popes and the Normans to whom the Crusades were mainly due.

A new race had spread in Europe in the ninth century—the Norsemen, descended from the old flat-headed Scandinavian stock. They appeared as Vikings or "men from the bays" in the northern seas, and as Varangers or "corsairs" in the Euxine. How widely these daring seamen ranged, after the tenth century, we may judge from the discovery of one of their hoards in the Island of Skye where, in 1891, were found not only coins of Athelstane, but also silver coins of the Moslem rulers of Bokhara inscribed in Arabic. These belonged to the Saman family ruling Bactria in the tenth century. The Norsemen were not without a rude civilisation of Greek origin, as is witnessed by the contents of the dolmen tombs in Norway, but they were worshippers of Odin and Thor when they reached Normandy; and the conversion of Rollo in 912 A.D. was perhaps one of the most important events in European history. They took Christian wives from the Franks and Kelts; and from this mixture of races sprang the Norman stock, which was soon the most powerful and adventurous race in the West. Even before Duke William conquered England, Norman mercenaries had begun to

offer their services to the small Greek republics under the Byzantine emperors in South Italy; and his contemporary Robert Guiscard ("the wily") conquered all the lands lying south of the estates of the Roman Church, while Robert's brother Roger subdued Sicily. They were sons of a valvassour or gentleman of Hauteville in Lower Normandy, and Robert died fighting for the conquest of Greece. Pope Leo IX. found it necessary to submit to Norman power, and by its aid Hildebrand was able to shake off the suzerainty of the German Emperor, and to found the new policy whereby the Pope was to become the legitimate successor of the Augusti, and Europe was to acknowledge a feudal supremacy of Rome intended to unite Christendom under the Pontiff.

The romantic character of the Normans renders this period of history of peculiar fascination, and great figures such as Godfrey, Richard, Saladin, St. Louis, or Francis of Assisi also shine out amid the general gloom of narrow fanaticism and savage ignorance. The ideal of the Christian knight—brave, modest, faithful, courteous, and just—is distinctively Norman. The feudal system was based on the idea that every rank had its duties as well as its rights; but it was hampered by the belief in caste, which was not confined to Europe. The proud nobles and Brahmans of India were equally exclusive in the same age, and Japan also was passing through the same feudal stage. The rule of the baron and the bishop, like that of the Brahman and the Kshatra, tended to tyranny when their tenants were heavily taxed, their peasants reduced to slavery or to serfdom, and their strong castles and cathedral towers surrounded only by walled villages of hovels. Tolls and guarded bridges every twenty miles, with the persecution of Jewish creditors and Moslem merchants,

obstructed trade; and from such narrow tyranny Europe was only set free by the Crusades.

The Crusades[1] have been variously regarded according as the glamour of enthusiasm for mediæval faith, or the dullness of utilitarian prejudice, has affected the student. The sincerity of popular belief is not to be doubted, but it was guided not only by Papal policy but by Norman ambition, and Italian trading interests. Europe was fighting against a very real danger, and the possession of Palestine by the Franks, for two centuries, protected the ancient trade routes and enriched the West. The power of the Papacy was immensely increased when the princes of South Italy, and of Syria, owned the Pope as their feudal lord. The decline of the Church dates from the fall of Acre, in 1292 A.D., although at his jubilee in 1300 Boniface VIII. still had carried before him the two swords—temporal and spiritual—and appeared in Imperial robes. It was a very poor, wild, and ignorant Europe that wrested the Holy Land from the Turk; but the civilisation that resulted in the thirteenth century destroyed both the Papal power and the feudal system. It is represented by the brilliant Swabian emperor Frederic II., and by the enlightened Sultan of Egypt with whom he corresponded on science and philosophy, and from whom—in spite of the Popes—he regained peaceful possession of the Holy City for a time.

The immediate results of Frank rule in Syria and Palestine appear in the foundation of universities, in the growth of large free cities in Italy, and in the extension of Genoese and Venetian trade with the East. Education had died out with the fall of Rome. The Latin tongue had become unintelligible, and Greek was scarcely known at all in the West. In the tenth century hardly a scholar was to be found

[1] See my volume "The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem," 1897.

in Rome who knew even the rudiments of letters, and King Alfred complained that his priests did not understand the prayers, and could not translate Latin. The complaint against clerical ignorance continues among all the leading spirits of the age in the thirteenth century, and down to the Reformation; but in the East the Europeans recovered the works of Aristotle and Plato, and learned the old education preserved by a few scholars in Byzantium. The "seven arts" did not, it is true, include much more than was known to Seneca, but with Rhetoric, Logic, and Grammar they included Arithmetic, Astronomy, Music, and Geometry. Much was learned from the Jews and Moslems of Spain, and from the Arabs of Syria; but the Popes placed their veto on translations of the Korān, which first appeared in the twelfth century. The influence of the Syrian and Nestorian monks, who had preserved Greek literature in their colleges and monasteries, was probably greater than that of non-Christian scholars; and after the Norman conquest of Constantinople, in 1217 A.D., Byzantine teachers began to find their way to Italian universities.

The medical school of Salerno was famous even before the first Crusade,[1] and Bologna had guilds of foreign students in the end of the twelfth century. It was encouraged by Frederic I., and by Frederic II. who founded the University of Naples. Paris had a university in the middle of the twelfth century, and its "four nations" were recognised by the Pope in 1231 A.D. Oxford owed its development to the return of English students from Paris during the wars with France. Salamanca in Spain, and Cambridge, were constituted only in the early part of the fourteenth century, and few German universities are older than the Reformation, though Geneva and

[1] Rashdall, "Universities of the Middle Ages," 3 vols. 1895.

Pesth trace to the fourteenth, Wurzburg, Leipzig, and Basle to the first half of the fifteenth century. Tubingen dates only from 1487 A.D., and Luther's University of Wittemburg from 1502 A.D. The conquest of Constantinople by the Turks drove many scholars to Italy, but education traces back to the first intercourse between mediæval Europe and Asia, and to the foundation of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

Material prosperity in Europe was also due to the conquest of Syria. The small feudal towns were but villages compared with Byzantium, Damascus, and Baghdad. Rome was in ruins; and the castles and churches of Syria, in the twelfth century, rivalled those which rose in Europe in the fifteenth, when the art of the Italian Normans—founded on the Romanesque—spread to the North. The poor nobles who sought fortunes in Asia were forced to sell municipal rights to the burghers, when raising funds to support their knights; and the "new and detestable communes" spread from Italy to France in the time of St. Louis. In the twelfth century Milan was much larger than the capitals of the North, and, though reduced to ruins by the Germans in 1162 A.D., it was as large as Damascus in 1288 A.D. For the emperors of Germany found it impossible to subdue the free republics of Lombardy, which finally accepted the rule of an elected Podesta, or of a native Signore.

The trade of the great republics steadily increased after 1100 A.D., when the fleets of Pisa, Genoa, and Venice brought succour to the Crusaders, whose well-drilled army, clad in better mail than the Turks, with longer spears and long bows that shot farther than the Byzantine cross-bow or the Turkish bow of horn, had forced their way over the barren plateau of Asia Minor to Antioch. But when the pride and corruption of a rapacious Church roused general discontent in Europe, and Syria was lost in consequence of the

fatal struggle between the Pope and the Emperor, the Italians protected their trade by agreements with Moslem rulers. The shrewd Venetians—forced to relinquish the Black Sea route to their Genoese rivals, who soon found it obstructed by the Mongols—enriched themselves by developing the Indian trade through Egypt. The agents of these great cities penetrated to Central Asia, brought furs from Siberia even in the twelfth century, and enriched Italy at a time when England had only just discovered coal, and had only a small trade in wool with the Continent.

But while civilisation was thus spreading from Italy, Asia also advanced under the Mongols of far Karakorum. Mongol races have never been unwilling to adopt any new idea which has appeared useful to themselves. The Khitai of Central Asia used the "Greek fire" (petroleum) which the Byzantines taught the Franks to employ in war; they also used the Nestorian and Indian alphabets, and possessed a considerable education when they invaded China in 916 A.D.[1] The defeat of the Khitan *Gur-khan* (or "world lord") named Ong-Khan, by Tchengiz the Mongol, in 1206 A.D., transferred his power to the great family which ruled from Pekin to Moscow, and from Siberia to the Persian Gulf, in the thirteenth century. Their civilisation was described to Europe by Rubruquis the Franciscan in 1253 A.D., and by Marco Polo forty years later. At the court of Mengku, grandson of Tchengiz, the former traveller found the Christian, Moslem, and Buddhist faiths equally tolerated, but the Khans themselves were educated in the ethics of Confucius. The empire was connected by a great system of posts similar to that of the Persians, as described by Herodotus. French goldsmiths, and captives from Armenia, brought their

[1] See Howorth, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XIII. ii. pp. 155–176; and Kingsmill, in *N. China Branch Journal*, 1886.

arts to the capital; and the great Khan was eager to inform himself as to the politics and culture of Europe. Kublai, the son of Mengku, added South China to the empire in 1279 A.D., though his armada failed to conquer Japan in 1281 A.D. Even when the Mongol power declined, at the end of the century, China retained its high civilisation under the Ming dynasty, which resisted Timur. The fame of this Oriental empire reached Europe, where Ong-Khan was known as Prester John (having apparently been converted by the Nestorians), and when Tchengiz became the bold Cambuscan of Chaucer[1] who, as the friend of Petrarch (visiting Padua in 1373), became acquainted not only with the name of Aristotle but also with the book of Marco Polo. Timur the Tartar (1359–1405) had then restored the glory of the empire, as a pious Moslem who effected the conquest of North India, though he failed to recover China. He is remembered in Europe mainly on account of the cruelties his army perpetrated in Armenia; but the civilisation of his great capital at Samarkand, the glorious architecture of its mosques, and the learning of its literary men, perhaps surpassed anything then to be found in England or France; while his merchants traded not only with the whole of Asia, but, through Moscow, with the Hanseatic towns, and by sea with the Italian cities. His victory at Angora, in 1402, delayed the fall of Constantinople to the Turks by half a century, and probably thus had far-reaching consequences in Europe.

After the Papal attempts to enlist the Mongols in favour of Christendom, or to convert the sultans of Iconium, had failed, and after Acre was taken, there was no longer any question of Crusades for the recovery of Syria from the Egyptians, but rather a

[1] Chaucer, "The Squieres Tale," 266–670; Spenser, "Fairie Queen," IV. ii. 31.

pressing need to protect Europe from the inroads of the Turks, when, in 1300 A.D., the house of Othman succeeded to the power of the Seljuks in Asia Minor, and their fleets ravaged the Mediterranean, appearing even at Nice as early as 1330 A.D. They crossed into Europe twenty years later, and Asia was divided between Mongols on the East and Turks on the West, between Moslems and Confucians, under conditions which—as far as native civilisation is concerned —have not materially changed since the fifteenth century. When the Osmanlis recovered from the anarchy consequent on their defeat at Angora, Europe was soon astounded by the Varna victory, and by the extinction of the Greek Empire on the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The great Suleimān was repulsed from the walls of Vienna in 1529, but his predecessor Selim had compensated himself for his defeat by the Sufi dynasty in Persia by the conquest of Syria and Egypt in 1517 A.D. Asia under Turanian rule made no further progress in civilisation; but the terror of the Turk forced on Charles V. the toleration of the Protestants in Germany.

How much we owe in England to the Crusades, after Edward III. had made peace with Bibars at Acre in 1272, and Edward III. his commercial treaty with Venice in 1325, is still witnessed by many Arab words which have become a part of our language.[1] The shalot came from Ascalon, and the damson from Damascus; the oriental plane was brought to Ribston by the Templars. In the fourteenth century the silk of Tarse was known to the author of "Piers Ploughman"; and a dispassionate account of the religion of Muhammad appears in the book of Sir John Maundeville. Under our great Plantagenets, who ruled

[1] See Skeat, Dictionary, 1888, p. 760: admiral, alcali, artichoke, barberry, camlet, cipher, civet, lute, mattress, mohair, monsoon, saffron, tabby, talc, tariff.

western France as well as Great Britain, the nation began to develop its own civilisation, and formed its own English language till, with the close of the fourteenth century, Wyclif founded the Reformation at Oxford. This progress was delayed for a century by the reaction that followed under the Lancastrians, and by the dying struggles of feudalism, before the full influence of the Renaissance was felt under the Tudors; but it traces back even to the end of the twelfth century, when Richard I. settled the Eastern question with Saladin and saved Palestine for Europe.

In France also, from the days of St. Louis, the same civilising influences were equally felt. The feudal militia failed to face the paid mercenaries who became the curse of Italy after the peace of Bretigny in 1360. The struggle against feudalism continued till it was practically extinguished by Louis XI., before the close of the fifteenth century, which is marked throughout Europe by gradual consolidation into kingdoms opposed to the Papal power. In Germany, under the descendants of Rudolph of Hapsburg after 1273 A.D., the ancient confederation of states was maintained, and the ancient independent spirit. In 1330 Schwartz, however, gave to Europe the doubtful gift of gunpowder, which Venice first used in the field of battle, which finally made armour obsolete, and gave Constantinople a prey to Muhammad II.[1] On the other hand, we must remember that to Germany we also owe the invention of printing, by means of movable blocks such as had been used in China and Korea several centuries before.

As early as the close of the twelfth century Philip Augustus, the greatest king of France since Charle-

[1] Gunpowder is said to have been known to Moslems in the thirteenth, and even in the eleventh century (Lecky's "European Morals," 11th edit. 1894, ii. p. 210). It is also said to have been made by Roger Bacon about 1270 A.D.

magne, had bidden Innocent III., in the very height of Papal power, "not to meddle in the affairs of princes." While the fallen successors of this supreme pontiff were exiles at Avignon (from 1305 to 1378 A.D.) the Swedish Saint Bridget declared that the Pope flayed the flock of Christ, and had changed all the ten Commandments to one—"Money, money!" Soon after, Europe was confounded by the great schism (1378 to 1418 A.D.) and by the wars of the Bohemian Reformation, until some peace was restored to the Church at Constance, and the Pope was taught that he was no longer to be above all human law—as Innocent III. openly claimed to be—but subject to a General Council. Yet even at Constance (in 1415) all thinking men were disgusted at the decay of feudal belief in the sanctity of a promise, when Sigismund betrayed the learned Hus to his priestly foes, and by the decision to defer the question of reforming the Church to another Council, which failed to meet till it was too late to prevent the great rupture between the Teutonic and Latin races. Meanwhile, however, Italy herself was steadily advancing in culture and wealth towards the great days of the Renaissance. In the fourteenth century her art—founded on the stiff Gothic style of Byzantium, which Cimabue imitated—was slowly casting aside its conventions to attain its full flower in the beginning of the sixteenth century. The Renaissance was the transference to the Italianised Goths of the ancient culture of Greece and Asia. We are puzzled, in reading its literature, whether most to admire the brilliance of its art and education, or to detest the cynical selfishness of its ruling class. The idea of Plato that education should be equal for the two sexes found expression in the fifteenth century, as we know from the charming letters of the great ladies of the age; but the savage immorality of the Borgias, and the treachery of the ruling nobles, show us also

that the picture of a prince drawn by Macchiavelli was regarded as one which any wise man of the world could admire. We are attracted and repelled alternately by Catherine of Siena in the fourteenth century and Boccacio in the fifteenth; but if we would see summed up in one work the glory and the shame of the Renaissance, we may find them both in the frank memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini as late as the sixteenth.

The general tendency to consolidate into nations, under native kings, made Spain also a great country on the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella, and after the conquest of Granada, in 1492, when the last Moslem power in Europe was destroyed. But it was to Arab civilisation that Spain also owed the knowledge of geography and astronomy which enabled Columbus to convince Boccacio as to the reality of his great idea of a new unknown world, and which, moreover, led Portugal, five years after Columbus (in 1492 A.D.) started west, to explore the eastern route, which Vasco da Gama found for his country, past the Cape to India, on seas where neither the Venetian nor the Turk had power. Portugal showed the way to the English adventurers who so soon followed. By the end of the fifteenth century all those elements of civilisation which have developed so rapidly since were thus to be found in the germ throughout the whole of Western Europe.

iii. **Modern History, 1500–1900 A.D.**—The third period of civilisation is only as yet one-third as long as that of the mediæval ages, but the development has been yet more rapid and complex. In Asia the change was slow, and depended chiefly on the influence of the Portuguese, Dutch, and English, until the rise, in 1868, of a new native centre of progress in Japan, whose history, after her defeat of the armada of Kublai Khan, was very similar to that of the other

island-kingdom in the West after the scattering of the Spanish Armada by English seamen. Like earlier Mongols, Japan took from the West all ideas that could be useful to herself. Like us, she has refused to allow to the foreigner any share in the government of her home. The courtesy, modesty, and kindliness of Japanese manners are based on the precepts of Confucius; and the boastful insolence of Western nations is as contemptible in their eyes as it was when they expelled the arrogant Jesuits, and the rapacious Portuguese and Dutch, in the seventeenth century. Sea power, and a sea home, have nursed freedom in the great islands of the Far East, as well as in the Far West. Chinese civilisation decayed when the less cultured Manchus conquered the empire in 1640; but when we accuse the Chinese of narrow conceit and prejudice, we should remember that they know the civilisation offered to them at home not to be the highest type of European progress. Taught by Japanese example, China also in time will develop her native faculties. The Mongols of India were more nearly in touch with the West, and Aurungzebe—the greatest of the philosophic Moslem emperors—permitted the settlement of English traders at Bombay and Calcutta at the close of the seventeenth century, with results which, though fatal to his declining house, were of lasting benefit to his country.

Passing west, we find little to admire in the empire of Turkey. Even in 1432 the Burgundian knight, Bertrandon de la Brocquière, who was an honest and sympathetic observer of manners, gives a gloomy account of the drunkenness and vice of the Turk. Pierre Belon in the sixteenth century found agriculture decaying in Syria and Anatolia. Zuallardo tells us of the intense suspicion of Europe felt in the Turkish Empire, of the number of spies, and of the cruel fate of a Spanish lady who tried to convert Moslem

women, and who was burned head downwards at a stake before the south doors of the Cathedral at Jerusalem.[1] Yet we cannot say that the Turks were entirely unprogressive. They not only had gunpowder in the fifteenth century, but adopted coffee by the end of the sixteenth, and tobacco soon after.

Modern history in Italy begins with the savage French invasions, and with the new troubles of the Church. Her wealth made her the prey of the North, and of Spain, till the close of the eighteenth century, when she was robbed by Jewish Massena and rapacious Murat. The etiquette of Spanish usurpers in the South survived under Bourbons till Italy was united under the house of Savoy, but even now she has failed as yet to find freedom from social and religious corruption, and looks back sadly to the days of Tasso and Raphael, Savonarola, Bruno, and Galileo. Throughout Europe, in the four centuries of modern history, we trace the same contrast between the highest and the lowest, the thought and science of the few, and the ignorant prejudice of the masses. Spain, when at the height of her power under Charles V. and his son, was notorious for her cruelties in America and the Canaries, as well as in the Netherlands, for a detestable Inquisition, and savage bullfights. Yet even the declining days of the early seventeenth century are distinguished by the names of Cervantes, Velazquez, and Murillo. Spain was enriched by the spoils of Mexico and Peru, which the Dutch absorbed, and which English pirates took from her; but though we condemn her barbarity to the civilised natives of America, we hardly pity them when we read of the wholesale human sacrifices in their temples. The Mexican priests had learned the highest ideas of

[1] See Bohn's "Early Travels in Palestine," 1848, p. 348; Pierre Belon, "Observations," 1555, ii. 15; Zuallardo, "Divotissimo Viaggio," 1586, i. pp. 36, 59.

Buddhist ethics, yet they tore out the hearts of thousands of living victims. The Incas of Peru, in the thirteenth century, had introduced Mongol civilisation and the Indian calendar. Like the Mongols they had an Imperial postal service, suspension bridges, well-made roads, quilted armour (the mediæval gambison), aqueducts, and statues of gold; but they too celebrated the most cruel sacrifices of boys and girls.

In the sixteenth century Germany led the way in reformation of mediæval abuses. She has her own great names in science and art, from Kepler and Leibnitz to Goethe, yet she was the last civilised nation of Europe to shake off the bonds of feudal caste. In France we find the same story of civilisation struggling with savage passions. Montaigne[1] tells us that the French nobles attributed the success of Charles VIII. to the over-education of Italians. We can well believe that the French nobles were not very polished when we remember that, in 1527, the Imperialists, under the Constable of Bourbon, after sacking Rome, paraded the cardinals naked through the streets, mounted on asses with their faces to the tails. Montaigne, however, is silent as to the French disaster at Pavia. He was no doubt right in preferring Plato and Vergil to Boccacio and Rabelais; and his learning and humour are the glory of early French civilisation. He tells us that he could not have believed, if he had not himself seen it, the delight in murder and torture which characterised the warriors of his own times. He himself thought (like Asoka) that we should have some regard to the sufferings even of beasts.

Unfortunately for France, the general character of her nobles did not much improve. When Louis XIII. died, a rapacious nobility was still striving to resist the consolidation of the kingdom; and the good Oratorians failed to redeem a corrupt Church, whose

[1] Montaigne, 1580: "Of Pedantry"; "Of Books"; "Of Cruelty."

bishops did not even consider it necessary, in some cases, to take holy orders, and married in spite of Rome. The life of "La Grande Mademoiselle" presents to us still a picture of mediæval barbarism. French "Memoirs," from Saint Simon down to Mercy d'Argenteau, show us how savage were the manners of well-dressed courtiers, who were yet dirty and superstitious, down to the days of Louis XVI., when French science and thought were dominating Europe. The triumph of the Jesuits when Louis XIV. was still the terror of Europe resulted in the driving forth to other lands of thousands of his best subjects. The Patrician and the starving mob were left face to face; and liberty, thus repressed, produced an explosion which shook Europe for fifteen years, till the great Napoleonic storms had cleared the air. But France was taught in the school of adversity for sixty years after Waterloo, before she was able to take her place once more in the van of human progress. The savage Russia of Peter the Great is now passing through the same fearful experience a century later than France. The country of "Anna Karenina" began her new birth by military disaster, as France did after Blenheim; and even if her struggle be not prolonged, it is more terrible than the three years of the Terror in Paris.

The England which Erasmus so heartily admired was the England of Moore's "Utopia," and of the highly educated prince who was to become the enemy of the Reformation as Henry VIII. But the real Renaissance of Britain dates from the days of Elizabeth, whose wisdom was schooled by early adversity. No patriotic ruler ever understood better the needs and temper of a free people than did Elizabeth. Yet when we think of poor Mary—the victim of the Catholic League—among her wild Scottish subjects, whose suspicions were roused by

French intrigue threatening the very life of the nation, a prisoner in that little gloomy palace of Holyrood, which we contrast with the houses of the Dorias, we see how slowly civilisation spread to the far North. It was a time when savage executions, assassination, and forgery were regarded—as in Italy—as being necessities of statecraft. The aged Elizabeth showed the Spanish ambassador three hundred heads of traitors on London Bridge. But the better influences of Italian culture were equally felt. The Roman characters replaced the German black-letter. Spenser does not scruple to translate whole stanzas of Tasso in his "Fairie Queen." Shakespeare knew not only Italian literature, but even the name of the South American god Setebos. Elizabeth herself was educated beyond the average of Englishwomen to-day. She could not only speak French and Italian, and read Latin and Greek, but she had studied Cicero, Livy, and Demosthenes, and knew the Gospels in the original tongue. In her reign, besides the corsair Drake, and Hawkins who sold black slaves to Spaniards in collusion with London aldermen, there were sober traders in the Levant and in India whom Elizabeth encouraged, and finally, in 1599, she granted a charter to the East India Company, recognising a trade which was even then more than half a century old. Yet Elizabeth also consulted the magician, Dr. Dee.

We may pursue such contrasts to our own times. The age of Bacon was one in which witch-burning became a mania. The Renaissance continued under James I.; but his son and grandsons, unfortunately for themselves, inherited the strangely perverse character of Anne of Denmark rather than the shrewdness of her husband. Much that was admirable in English social life disappeared in the struggle for freedom, and when Charles II. brought in the evil manners of the French Court. Even if we do not

believe the revelations of savagery in Gramont's memoirs, we must accept the frank confessions of corruption by Pepys. But this, too, was the time of Locke and Newton: it was the age of Penn, as well as that in which the disgraceful African Company was sanctioned. The times of Walpole, when corruption in public life was at its height, the days of the South Sea Bubble and of Law's Scheme, were those of the society depicted in "Evelina," yet the age of Johnson and Reynolds; the year 1799, which witnessed the savage cruelties of revenge in Ireland, was that of Jenner's great discovery; and Watt's steam-engine was then seventeen years old. Even when the great Victorian age opened, our laws were still savage, and our population less than half what it now is. The wars of the Continent were our opportunities for industrial conquests, from the time when we founded the China trade during the Thirty Years' War, or took Delhi during the Seven Years' War. Yet the struggle for civilisation and freedom is still unending, and must remain so while corruption, superstition, and ignorance exist. Those who use civilised inventions call themselves civilised, though they may be still plunged in Gothic barbarism.

Looking back over the five thousand years of growing civilisation, we perceive how natural causes—over which man had no control—brought about the great changes which resulted in the spread of knowledge, and in the taming of wild tribes. Pressing needs alone stirred men to improvement. They were driven along strange paths by the rod. Their passions and follies were the means by which new conditions were established; their policies and dogmas led to things quite unexpected; and out of the evil of one generation sprang the good of the next. Can we doubt that an eternal purpose has guided man to higher things by dark, mysterious ways?

CHAPTER IV

HISTORIC RELIGIONS

1. **Animism.**—Religion is born of Fear and Love. The great fact which filled the thoughts of man from the first was the fact of death. What was that unknown power which broke the tyrant's arm by some unforeseen death when his might seemed resistless? What was that fluttering thing within which ceased to heave the breast of the beloved? How could man soothe the wrath of the unseen powers bringing sickness and sorrow on the tribe? How could he bring to his aid against the foe those kindly beings whose help had made him happy and prosperous? Such were the thoughts roused in the mind by man's knowledge of his own helplessness and ignorance: thoughts about God and the soul, about good and evil, about the past, present, and future.

The age in which man as yet had not learned the necessity of law was that in which he regarded the world as full of individual spirits doing what they would. Mutual help was felt needful from the first, for even beasts unite to help each other against their foes; and thus, when man divided all the unseen spirits into two classes—the kindly and the hostile—he sought to please such as would help him, and to restrain bad spirits by fear. The terror of darkness caused him to regard all evil beings as belonging to the dark, and all good beings as belonging to light, and to life-giving warmth, as contrasted with the cold

of death. Everything that moved, man regarded as being alive. The fire and the stream were living snakes; the sun and moon were great birds, and the little stars were their children. The storm was a warrior armed with thunderbolts. The breeze was an invisible swift messenger who was felt to pass by, or a clever thief who stole light things, or the faithful dog who drove the cloud-cows from the den of the detaining monster. There was no "problem of evil" as yet, because man thought it natural that—like himself—evil beings should do harm to those whom they hated. He only doubted whether to rely on the trusty spirits as more powerful than the demons of darkness, or whether to enter into alliance with these. Hence, from the first, Religion and Magic were opposed; and, just as men hated the selfish for their deceit and violence, so also they hated the witch leagued with powers of evil. The gods were kindly and immortal beings: they were not ghosts, nor were they devils. The natural fear of darkness, which is due to nervous uncertainty about the unseen, peopled the night with spectres; but the gods were visible in the shining heavens above as very real and substantial beings—the bright orbs, and the light of dawn. They were also the spirits which animated the trees and springs. Heaven was married to Earth, and from this pair sprang all other immortal beings. The divine family resembled the human, and the devils also were children of an evil pair—gods of darkness and death.

As civilisation increased, and ideas of law began to develop, the independent spirits, who could be conjured even to dwell in stones or in houses, were grouped under a few great rulers obedient to the primeval pair. The pantheons of all the early civilised races consist of the same beings under various names. They include the spirits of Heaven

and Earth, Sun and Moon, Sky, Water, and Fire, with the Wind. Or otherwise these children of the universe are represented as ruled by the three great kings of Heaven, Ocean, and Hell. In no instance was the early conception that of disembodied beings: the gods were material and limited individuals. Yet, as the perception of order in the universe became clearer, even the great gods became subject to some unknown control, and were said to be ruled by Fate.

The belief in a single and consistent Will, ordering all events wisely and inevitably, led, however, to man's becoming puzzled at length by evil. He conceived that evil ought not to exist, because he felt its repulsion; and he asked, therefore, was this Will not good, or was it not all-powerful? Why should not happiness be eternal and general? What was the use of sorrow and sickness? The evil demons were recognised as servants of the good God of Heaven; but why did He afflict men by their means? The answer which the Akkadian gave was humble and simple: "God is not understood by men." It was the answer also of the Hebrew, who accepted evil as well as good from the God who sent both. But other nations sought to excuse God from the imputation of being either not good or not almighty. The Buddhist said that evil was one of the effects of illusion—which was not comforting to those who suffered. The Greek said that man was responsible, because he had the free choice between doing what he should and neglecting so to do. But man knew very well that evil had nothing to do with his intentions. In all early languages he recognised "sin" as something in which he had failed to do what was for his own good, and had thus displeased God. But in the Akkadian and Vedic prayers alike we find man making excuse for his error; and words for "sin"

signify weakness, failure, misunderstanding, and unintended slips. Man was guided in the way by the rod, and shrank from it. He thought his will to be free, though he knew that every deed was inevitable; because he failed to perceive guidance by the eternal and consistent will of a universal Intelligence. The Greek atheist denied such Intelligence, and said that all things followed mechanical law, like the planets wheeling round the sun; for he knew nothing of the slow changes which even they are undergoing, or of the eternal purpose which we recognise in Evolution as the witness of Eternal Will. The influence of Greece still blinds the modern philosopher; and Blake almost alone had the courage to say that to God all things are good. The study of nature teaches us many lessons. In the American plains there grows a poisonous shrub, covering great spaces which neither man nor any beast of prey can pass. What use could a good being have intended to result from such an evil growth? The answer is that the antelope stamps with her armoured hoofs a nest in the midst, where she may safely lay her young.

The Burmese say that the soul is a butterfly which lives in the blood—you feel it fluttering in the heart, pulse, or lungs. So, too, in the West, Psyche (the soul) has butterflies' wings, and the emblem of future life was the butterfly coming out of the chrysalis buried in earth. Malebranche, indeed, seems to have thought that this metamorphosis was a proof of the immortality of the soul. Mankind did not get their ideas of a spirit from dreams—though dreams were thought to show that the soul was not always in the body—but from the evidence of their senses, which showed them that life depended on some energy within. It was thought—as savages still think—that the soul was a little being of some kind living inside man and beast. It might creep out of

a man's mouth as a mouse when he slept, and return before he woke. It might fly away as a small bird or a butterfly. It might be of the form of a child. But always it was regarded as having a body of its own, though that body might be of airy consistency, hardly to be seen and not to be felt. This idea of the soul survived even among civilised nations such as the Greeks, and it still is universally believed by savages. But the life of man was also thought to extend to the shadow and the reflection; and thus, in China and Egypt alike, man had three souls or spirits, as to which many vague and confused ideas existed. Plato calls the soul "the child within." Aristotle says that it is "small in size." Irenæus and Tertullian, no less than Origen, regarded the soul as corporeal. It is not indeed till the time of Descartes that the conception of a "disembodied spirit" appears to have arisen in Europe, and it is not very clear what he meant by the term. The Persians said that the soul existed before the body to which it gave activity.[1] The Buddhists said it was as small as a grain of corn. The later Hindu philosophers, however, following Plato, long before Descartes, declared that the soul is "imperishable, perpetual, unchanging, immovable, without beginning . . . immaterial, passing all thought, and immutable."[2]

Among uncivilised races the soul was not regarded as immortal. It could be killed, and it was starved unless pious descendants provided it with spirit food by offerings at the tomb. When these ceased the spirit faded away. When leaving one body it found a home in another, and lived a long series of lives not only in man or beast but even in plants or in

[1] Bundahish, xv. 4.

[2] "Institutes of Vishnu," Sacred Books of the East, vii. p. 82; Plato, "Republic," bk. x.

stones. This idea of transmigration we meet in all religions from the first; and "Animism," or the belief in airy beings inhabiting every object that moved, was a feature of all religions. Many terms which have been used to express this idea are but partial explanations of the general conception. Fetishism is only a rude idolatry, based on the belief that a soul could be imprisoned in some particular object. It was not the stock or stone, but the spirit within it, which was adored. Totemism (by a singular blunder) has come to be regarded as the original faith of mankind, but it is only a rude form of the general idea of transmigration. Ancestor worship is not an original feature of belief, for man feared ghosts in general long before it became a pious duty to please the spirit of the parent who was thought able to help his offspring. The belief in spirits existed when the dead were still hidden away in the forest, or given to the vultures and the dogs.[1]

There are three lines of modern research into the origin and nature of religion which have been separately followed. Students of savage belief, and of peasant folk-lore, have collected a mass of material as to the confused and constantly changing ideas of the ignorant. But these are not only often very hard to understand: they are vague, and are also only decayed survivals of ancient beliefs, mingled with many new thoughts taken from the teaching of the historic religions. Theories solely founded

[1] Fetish is the Portuguese *feitiço*, "a charm"—a term used by President De Brosses in 1760. Totem is a mistake for the Algonquin word *Ote*, for which Long in 1792 appears to be responsible. Recent researches in Australia show very clearly the connection of the Totem with the general belief in metempsychosis (see Frazer in *Fortnightly Review*, May 1899, on the researches of Spencer and Gillen). Taboo is a Polynesian term for anything "set apart," "consecrated," or "forbidden." It is quite unnecessary to use any of these terms, since natural ideas can be expressed in English.

on such data are liable to become very misleading, unless checked by actual knowledge of the oldest records of human belief. The study of sacred books is also, by itself, an imperfect means of attaining to real knowledge of the past. We have to rely on copies which, in all cases, are late; and we can, as a rule, only conjecture the alterations and additions made by generations of scribes. The book religion of any people does not represent that of the illiterate peasant, though it generally includes survivals of prehistoric beliefs. The third line of research requires a very special knowledge of languages and scripts which as yet are studied by few; but in the contemporary records of ancient times, in the symbolism and art, the funerary and other customs, illustrated by excavation of temples and tombs, we find generally the earliest and clearest indications of the growth of religion. It is from such sources that we may endeavour to trace the development of historic faiths; and by actual knowledge of the past we can best understand savage customs, found whether in Europe or in Australia to-day.

The belief in spirits lies then at the root of all faiths. The immortality of the soul was a very ancient idea among civilised races, but the soul was material and it survived by entering some other body. The idea of resurrection of the body itself is usually a much later conception, and is one not generally held, and which has always been denied by some even among races who accepted it. The bones were supposed to be imperishable, and the new body was conceived to grow from them, or from some particular bone—such as the *os coccygis* according to the Rabbis.[1] That the soul should either return to earth in a new incarnation, or that it should live with the immortal gods on high, were not original beliefs of mankind. It went to the

[1] Bereshith, "Rabbah," 28.

hollow caverns under earth, where it either abode for ever as a shade, or, when discontented and escaping its prison, it haunted the tomb, or the house of its impious descendants. The Egyptians do not appear to have believed in resurrection, though they did believe in transmigration. The Akkadians, it is true, spoke of Marduk (the sun) as "giving life to the dead," but they called Sheol "the land without return," and they dreaded the return of ghosts to "the land of the living." Homer[1] speaks of "meadows of asphodel where dwell souls the images of the dead"; but he draws a fearful picture of the hungry spectres in the far north, lamenting their fate, and striving to return to life by drinking blood from the sacrificial trench. Horace[2] is equally hopeless when he thinks of fate, and of the river of hell that he must pass to "Pluto's ghostly house," although he scoffs at "the fabled manes." Even the Persians only believed in resurrection of the pious, which the later Jews held to be taught in their Law.[3] The Valhalla of the Norse was a "heroes' hall" only reached by those whom the Valkyries (or "hero-choosers") carried thither. For men in general there was no hope of any future life save in the weary Hades beneath, till Hindu philosophers began to teach a development of the old idea of transmigration, and declared that neither the Hells nor the Heavens were eternal.

Prayer was the natural cry of the child in darkness and trouble; sacrifice was the attempt to feed spirits with the soul-food from the slain victim; the idol was to man what the doll is to the child—a form half believed to be alive. Hence these features of religion meet us everywhere from the earliest known times. Myths have been regarded as poetry, or have been

[1] "Odyssey," xxiv. 12–14; see xi. 489.
[2] Horace, "Odes," I. iv., xxxv., II. xiv., III. xxiv.
[3] Mishnah, "Sanhedrin," XI. i.

said to be due to "disease of language," but they seem rather to represent the childlike philosophy of man, in ages when abstract ideas had no existence, and his attempts to explain the nature of the phenomena which puzzled him. Myths also are common to every race, and some are so ancient that they appear to have become "sayings" long before the historic nations separated from each other in Asia.

As religions grew, and created sacred writings, they became subject to two forms of disease or excess: to formalism and ritual on the one hand, and to mysticism on the other. Scribes who pored over sacred books wrote commentaries which, like their texts, came in time to be also regarded as divinely inspired. The desire to obey and to please the gods caused steady increase in ritual, and a constant increase in the cost of sacrifice. The commentaries on the Vedas, on the Zendavesta, and on the Korān, are as voluminous as the Talmud, or as the writings of Christian fathers. The spirit of the original faith was thus generally lost when overgrown by the accretions of later comment. But mysticism has perhaps been yet more dangerous to true religion by obscuring the truth. Man from the earliest times has sought to escape from the natural limitations of his existence in the body, and has found proof—as he supposes—of immortality in the illusions due to abuse of the senses.

Spiritualism and hypnotism are thus as old as history. The impressions caused by the revival of former experiences of the brain are often as real as those originally due to an actual event. Dreams, visions, and ghosts alike, are caused by such revival of recorded vibrations. The only obscure question still to be studied is the cause of such revivals of sensation: whether due solely to some reflex action of the nerves, or brought about by some really external influence. Hypnotism is no new discovery, but a natural result

of abuse of the brain which has been practised from the earliest known ages. It is akin to sleep-walking and to epilepsy, and its final outcome is madness, or the incapacity for distinguishing between the real and the imagined. The hypnotic condition is not produced by the will of another, but by the paralysis which results from staring long and intently at some particular object. The dazed brain strives to recover its powers, and the victim thus willingly accepts suggestions from without which may aid it to return to consciousness of reality. Not only do Indian Yogis hypnotise themselves by staring at their noses, but the bird is hypnotised by staring at the dreaded snake, and the mouse paralysed by looking at the cat. It will in time come to be recognised that all who thus abuse the sense of sight are as much to be blamed as those who excite the brain by abuse of alcohol or of narcotic drugs. The great harm to religion which hypnotism has always wrought lies in the belief, held by mystics of all ages, that by such ecstasy they were able to "stand out" of their bodies, and to attain communion with the great soul of whom their souls were but parts imprisoned in material forms.

Such mysticism has run to two very opposite extremes. On the one hand the hypnotic condition has been found to be more easily attained when the body is weakened by austerities; and the ascetic is led to despise and to abuse his body, thus starving the diseased brain. On the other hand the hypnotic condition is closely connected with hysteric passion, and has been held to sanction a licence which carries the worshippers back to the age of savage orgies. The monks of Mount Athos in our eleventh century,[1] who saw the "light of Tabor" after staring long at their stomachs, induced the hypnotic state by the same methods which Yogis in India adopt. The

[1] Gibbon, chap. lxiii.

Montanists in Phrygia in the second century held "revivalist" meetings exactly like those of the Welsh to-day, or of the Moslems in Persia, and the negroes in America. The immoral meetings of the Adamites, among Christians, are indistinguishable from the Bacchic orgies which were forbidden by horror-stricken Romans in 186 B.C., or from the vile rites of existing Sakti sects in India. The "black mass" may have been imagined by Jesuits in the time of Louis XIV., when the dangerous Quietest movement of Miguel Molinos revived the doctrine of love which the Gnostic Carpocrates taught as well as the Krishnaic mystics; but it is probable that such secret orgies have always been practised, as they were by the Katzerie of Germany, or the Paturini of Milan in the middle ages. Such mystic and hysterical excesses have characterised the religions of all races. Whole congregations in Italy are still said to hypnotise themselves by staring at the altar or at the priest. Spiritualistic séances have been held in all ages, and have always been accompanied by impudent frauds; as when the Gnostic Marcus exhibited his effervescing Eucharist, or Alexander Abnotichos was famous as a medium. Spirit rappings are recorded all over the world, and were the rage in France in 1534, as Voltaire relates. Spiritual marriages are not an American invention, but were practised by the Marcosians in our second century. Tertullian admits that ecstasy is akin to madness. Porphyry and his master Plotinus, in the same age, were mystics who believed that they could attain to union with the Deity while yet in the body, like the Saniyasis of India, or the Sufis of Islam. It is a question whether religion on the whole has suffered most from the dull commentator and the ignorant priest, or from the mystic who deludes himself and his victims alike.

When from the superstitions of the past the Assyrians and the Persians attained to the conception of a supreme god ruling all the others, they still drew him as a human being with the wings and tail of an eagle—as we see him represented, not only at Nineveh, but on the tomb of Darius, where this form represents Ahura-mazdā the Creator. So too, when the Byzantines broke away from the earlier law of the Church, they pictured the Pantokrator (or "ruler of all") as an aged king on his throne. The daring of Italian artists, in the sixteenth century, represented Him as a robed giant striding in space, and measuring the world with a compass. Such pagan ideas unconsciously influence many yet: so hard is it for man to escape from the old savage conception of a large man in the clouds. Even the pantheists of Greece and India thought of God as a personality outside the world, and entering only into those things which were greatest or best. Plato vaguely conceived the idea, which Paul more clearly declared, of an infinite personality—an energy animating the universe of matter, an intelligence and will which we recognise in the eternal purpose revealed by the study of nature, a God "in whom" we live and move and have our being.

ii. **Egypt.**—The Egyptian loved life and feared death, like others, and believed in countless spirits animating men and beasts and all phenomena of nature. The hieroglyphic for the Ka—genius or spirit—consists of the sign of the phallus (which, among all rude and primitive races, was the emblem of life) joined to the sign of two arms raised in invocation, to which the sound *ka*, "to cry," attached. It was vaguely supposed that the life of man depended not only on a soul (*Ba*) within, but also on a genius or double (*Ka*), and that it moreover animated the

shade or shadow (*Ta*) which reappeared as a ghost. Thus the Ka dwelt in the statue placed in the antechamber of the tomb, and to it were offered the gifts of descendants, whose duty it was to insure the happiness of the departed soul during its long journey to join the gods, or when it fluttered as a human-headed bird down the air-shaft to look at the embalmed body, while the shade remained in Hades.

The earliest features of Egyptian belief included the worship of immortal gods, and the propitiation of all good spirits, whether of the dead or of the undying. The beast worship of the separate tribes, at various cities, was exactly similar to that of African savages to-day.[1] Each tribe had its sacred animal, and believed that the souls of great men migrated into such. Hence the bodies of bulls, crocodiles, cats, etc., were embalmed like those of men, to please the departed spirit by reverent care of the corpse. The belief in transmigration is evidenced by the renewal of the Apis, or sacred black bull, whenever it died, the soul passing into the newly discovered beast[2]; and Herodotus is thus correct in saying that the Egyptians believed "that the soul of man is immortal, and that when the body perishes it enters into some other animal." In the well-known "Tale of Two Brothers" (Anpu or Anubis, and Ba-ta, "the earth-soul"), the younger, who leaves his heart on the cedar and marries a fair witch, is reborn each time that he is killed, as a bull, a tree, or a babe. In the magic "Book of the Dead" we find the soul assuming various shapes in Hades, by

[1] See my paper on "Native Tribes of Bechuanaland," *Journal of Anthropological Institute*, 1886. Personal research, while in Africa in 1884, is the basis. The Zulus believe the souls of chiefs to pass into snakes: so do the Matabele as to the hippopotamus. The sacred beasts include the lion (Barotse), antelope (Bamanguato), monkey (Bakatla), wilde-beest (Bangwaketse), crocodile (Baquena), and fish (Batlapin), etc.

[2] Herodotus, iii. 28, ii. 123.

aid of various words of power, in order to escape its foes; but this is a later development of the old idea which seems to have been based, among all savages, on fear of savage beasts, and on admiration of those that were strong and useful to man.

In addition to these beliefs, which are traceable from the earliest known times, the Egyptians had other savage superstitions like those of modern Africans. They dreaded wizards, and used charms, offered sacrifices, and had, no doubt, ordeals, and initiatory ceremonies, like those of the Bechuana tribes to-day. That they offered human sacrifices at the tomb is shown by the discovery, in 1898, of the sepulchre of Amenophis II., who reigned in the sixteenth century B.C. In the ante-chamber M. Loret found a dried body bound to a richly painted boat: it had been gagged, and wounded in the breast and head. In the next chamber were bodies of a man, a woman, and a boy, who had also been slain. In the inmost chamber, with its dark blue roof studded with golden stars, the king lay in a rose-coloured sandstone sarcophagus, the mummy having wreaths round the neck and the feet.[1] There can be little doubt that slaves had thus been killed, in order that their ghosts might accompany that of their master. The tomb was used to hide the mummies of seven later kings,[2] and Amenophis II. is the only Pharaoh whose mummy has been found reposing in its original sepulchre.

Belief in witchcraft is also witnessed by the monuments as late as the reign of Rameses III,[3] when the traitor Penhi obtained a scroll from among the books of the king, and "formed human figures of wax," or, as otherwise related in the Rollin papyrus, "made

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette*, April 14, 1898.

[2] Thothmes IV., Amenophis III., Set-nakht, Seti II., Rameses IV., VI., VIII.

[3] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," 1879, ii. p. 163.

some magic writings to ward off ill luck; he had made some gods of wax, and some human figures to paralyse the limbs of a man." Magic, indeed, is hardly to be distinguished from religion in Egypt, except by the distinction between white (or beneficent) and black (or malevolent) sorcery. The famous collections of ancient texts, from sarcophagi of early date, to which the name *Peri-em-hru* (or "going forth from day") was given—now known as the Book, or Ritual, of the Dead—consist, indeed, of nothing but charms of the most primitive description, whereby the soul was fortified against its demon foes, appearing as snakes or crocodiles in Hades, and passed the pits of flame, and the closed gates of various regions, to reach the judgment hall of Osiris, where the heart was weighed before the Council of the gods. The wicked soul was then condemned to "second death," and given to the devourer—a monster waiting outside for his prey. The soul of the righteous was admitted to the company of the gods. It could ride with them in the sacred bark: it might even be absorbed as an Osiris in Osiris, or it might live happily as on earth, surrounded by wives, relatives, and friends, tilling the fields of Aalu, where grew gigantic corn, smelling sweet flowers, refreshed with water of life poured by a goddess from the sacred Persea tree, hunting, feasting, and playing draughts. The objects buried in tombs included not only images of guardian gods, but tools, weapons, dresses, wigs, and even children's toys, often broken, that the soul of the object might go with the dead.

The official religion of the divine king, and of his priests, while recognising the ancient family and city cults, added the worship of the immortal gods of the capital. The word *Nuter* signified a "power" or "smiter," symbolised by a stone axe. It included not only the spirits of the dead, but the immortals, who—

under various names in the different great cities—were recognised in the sun, moon, and wind, in the life-giving Nile, and in the dawn, as the rulers of all spirits found in man, beast, spring, or tree, and as children of the original pair—*Nut*, the heaven-mother brooding above, or symbolised as the divine cow with stars on its belly, and *Seb*, the earth-father, also symbolised as the goose that lays each day an egg of gold and an egg of silver, which are the sun and moon. The enemies of these gods are demons, under *Set*, the god of darkness and fire, the foe of the sun, and the seducer of *Neb-hat* (Nephthys) goddess of sunset. These evil gods also appear as *Bes*, the dwarf demon with grinning mask, and as his consort *Bast*, the hell-goddess with lion's head.[1] The mythical texts say that all good things were created by Osiris, and all evil things from the sweat of his brother and foe, Set.

The sun had four forms in all. Horus, or the rising infant sun, Ra the midday, called *Kheper* or "creating" heat, and Tmu the sunset, are followed by the old dead sun, Osiris, whose mummy is carried from west to east under earth, attended by his wives, Nephthys, the sunset (the false mistress of Set) and Isis, the dawn—mother of Horus, who is born anew each day. Hades is called the "land of the living," because peopled only by those who do not suffer "second death"; and Osiris, though daily slain, lives also again as Horus issuing to fight the dark foe. Thus in various texts[2] Horus is implored "to restore his father to life," and Osiris says, "I am yesterday, and I know the morrow which is Ra." I am *Tmu*

[1] *Set* or *Sut* means apparently "fire": *Neb-hat*, "mistress of the abode": *Bes* and *Bast* (fem.) "flame." See Pierret, "Vocabulaire," 1875, *s.v.* The Greeks called Bes the "god of fate." *Sekhet*, another form of Bast, was goddess of "destruction." She drank the blood of men slain by *Ra*, the god of "light and heat."

[2] See Renouf, "Trans. Bib. Arch. Soc.," ix. ii. p. 283; "Proceedings, B.A.S.," June 1896.

(the setting sun) and *Un* ("the upspringing"): the One alone, or *Ra* at his rising: the Lord of *Amenti*, or Hades. The gods had many names in different towns, but their characters were the same. They included Amen or Ptah, the "creating" sun: Aah or Thoth, the moon god; Hapi, the Nile; Shu, the atmosphere or air; Tefnut, his bride, the dew; and the dog-headed Anubis, messenger of the gods, who seems to answer to Hermes, and to the faithful Sarama dog of the Vedas —the "swift" wind.

The preservation of the mummy has led to the supposition that the Egyptians believed in the resurrection of the body; yet not only do the known texts not mention such resurrection on earth, but the removal of the brain and intestines also seems to suggest that the corpse was only preserved through some vague idea of pleasing and honouring the ghost. We read such texts as the following: "Remember the day when you too will leave for the land to which one goes, not to return thence," and the pathetic lament of an Egyptian lady desiring happiness for her husband after her own death: "For Amenti is the land of heavy slumber and of darkness, an abode of sorrow for those who dwell there. They sleep in their forms; they wake not any more to see their brethren: they know not their father and their mother; their heart cares not for their wife and children. . . . For the god there—'Death absolute' is his name. He calls all, and all come to obey him, trembling with fear before him. With him there is no respect for gods or men, to him the great are as the little. One fears to pray to him, for he hears not. None come to invoke him, for he is not kind to those who adore him: he considers not any offering made to him."[1]

[1] See Sharpe, "Egyptian Inscriptions," i. pl. 4; Renouf, "Hibbert Lectures," 1879, pp. 71, 242.

In addition to many myths connected with Amenti (Hades), and with the gods, the Egyptians had stories bearing a remarkable resemblance to those of Asia and Europe, which have come down to us as popular fairy tales. In the story of the "Doomed Prince," and in that of the "Two Brothers," the seven Hathors answer to the fairy godmothers, but predict evil. In the latter tale Bata leaves his heart on the cedar tree, reminding us [1] of the giant in Norse and Indian tales; and the scented lock of hair belonging to the witch which is washed by the sea to Egypt, and enchants the king, is an incident in one of the Bengali tales of Lal-Bahari-Dey. The horseman who climbs a tower to visit an imprisoned princess recalls Rapunzel's lover, and the tale is found in the Talmud and in the Babylonian myth of Gilgamas. It has been doubted if these tales originated in Egypt, and we know in two cases that foreign myths were accepted; for they occur in two cuneiform tablets, and are clearly Babylonian.[2] In another instance,[3] an Egyptian going by sea to the mines is wrecked on an island of fruit trees, guarded by a good serpent, who speaks with human voice, and gives wealth to the lucky sailor. This recalls the Babylonian legend of the magic garden under the sea, guarded (like the Greek garden of the Hesperides) by monsters, and visited by Gilgamas; as well as countless Hindu and European tales of Nagas and dragons guarding treasures. Such stories were probably very ancient in Asia, and spread to Egypt as well as to the West, and to India.

In contrast with such popular mythology we must not forget the higher philosophy of some Egyptian writings. They attained to vague ideas of a supreme

[1] Cox, "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," 1882, pp. 77–9.
[2] See my "Tell Amarna Tablets," 2nd edit. 1894, pp. 220–24.
[3] Golenisheff, "Sur un ancien Conte Égyptien," 1881.

deity, and to a primitive kind of Pantheism, perhaps as early as the sixteenth century B.C., under the great eighteenth Dynasty.[1] We read of "the Almighty, the self-existent, who made heaven and earth," and of Amen-Ra, "father of the gods . . . whose shrine is hidden. . . . Deliverer of the timid man from the violent, judging the poor, the poor and oppressed. Lord of wisdom whose precepts are wise . . . the One alone with many hands, waking when all men sleep, to seek the good of his creatures—Amen the all-sustainer." Again we read of Amen as Ptah the creator: "thou art youth and age; thou givest life to earth by thy stream: thou art heaven, thou art earth, thou art fire, thou art water, thou art air, and whatever is within them."

The religion of Egypt was much influenced by Asia, especially under the eighteenth dynasty, when three generations of kings—Thothmes IV., Amenophis III., and Amenophis IV.—married princesses from Armenia and from Babylon. The last-named king has even been called a "heretic," because certain texts had the name of Amen erased from them apparently in his time. He, however, was always addressed, by the foreign kings who wrote to him, as a worshipper of Amen; and parts of the ritual appear on his coffin. Pa-Aten seems to have been a title of Amen, and this king's mother (Teie) adored Aten or the "sun disk." One of his officials wrote a hymn to Aten in which he says, "The whole land of Egypt and all peoples repeat all thy names at thy rising."[2] The ancients generally recognised that the gods were the same in every system, though the names differed, as Plutarch says that, in all lands, they represent the sun and moon, the heaven, earth, and sea.[3] A text of

[1] Renouf, "Hibbert Lectures," 1879, pp. 218–32.

[2] See Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i. pp. 446, 449, 450, 455.

[3] See Mahaffy, "Silver Age," p. 361.

Amenophis IV. identifies Aten as the Theban name for Hor-makhu, "the shining sun."

In spite of the primitive and often savage nature of their beliefs, and in spite of the eternal duration of Amenti, the ethics of the Egyptians were highly developed from a very early period. The soul brought before Osiris pleads its innocency of life. "I have come to the city of those who dwell in eternity. I have done good on earth; I have done no wrong; I have done no crime; I have approved of nothing base or evil, but have taken pleasure in speaking the truth. . . . There is no lowly person whom I have oppressed. . . . The sincerity and goodness that were in the heart of my mother and father my love returned. . . . Though great I have done as though little. . . . I have repeated what I heard just as it was told me." "I was bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, clothes to the naked, a refuge to him that was in want; that which I did to him the great God has done to me." "I received those on the road, my doors were open to those who came from without." "My heart inclined me to the Right while I was yet a child . . . and God rewarded me for this, making me glad with the happiness which he granted me for walking after his way."

The maxims of Ptah-hotep are said to be as old as the fifth Dynasty, and in them we read: "If any one bears himself proudly he will be humbled by God who makes him strong. If you are wise bring up your son in the love of God . . . God loves the obedient and hates the disobedient." In the maxims of Ani (about the fourteenth century B.C.) we find: "Pray humbly with a loving heart all the words of which are uttered in secret. He will protect you in your affairs; He will listen to your words: He will accept your offerings. . . . It is He who smites him who is smitten."[1]

[1] Renouf, "Hibbert Lectures," 1879, pp. 73–5, 100–3.

Thus from very early days, in Egypt as well as in Asia, a simple piety bore fruit in kindliness, truthfulness, gratitude, humility, and all other virtues; and a vague Monotheism existed already at the time when Israel dwelt in the delta of the Nile. But such ethics, and even some approach to the conception of a single Creator, were equally ancient also among the civilised Akkadians of Chaldea.

iii. **The Akkadians.**—The Greeks and Romans were very ignorant about the true history of Babylonia and Assyria, and they knew nothing of the early Turanian population in times when it was subject to the Semitic, to which alone they usually refer. Herodotus knew the Babylonians under the Persians. Diodorus has collected misunderstood traditions, and his work is entirely worthless as to early conditions. It is on tablets, and texts from walls and statues, that we depend entirely for true knowledge of the question. The old Mongol race, which spread east and west from Chaldea, is called by some scholars Akkadian, and by some Sumerian, but neither word is really the name of a people. The great monarchs of Mesopotamia, from 'Ammurabi down, claimed to be supreme over Sumer and Akkad, that is to say, "the river plains and the highlands"; and, since the cradle of the race was in Kurdistan, the title Akkadian is perhaps the best to use, in distinguishing the Mongolic founders of civilisation from the Semitic race. It is to Assur-bani-pal (about 650 B.C.) that we owe the preservation of the Akkadian language and of Akkadian religious beliefs. He sought out what he calls "the ancient tablets of the heroes of Assyria and Akkad," and had them copied, and translated into Semitic speech. They were catalogued and stored in the library at Nineveh, but the originals have not been found, and the age to which they belonged is doubtful,

One tablet in the collection refers to the foundation of Babylon, and is therefore not older than 2250 B.C. Generally speaking this collection seems to represent the religion of the early Kassite civilisation, from the twenty-second to the fourteenth centuries before our era. The Assyrians had a great veneration for these ancient records of ritual and religion, though they belonged to quite another race, just as the Romans venerated the Etruscan books, on which their beliefs were mainly based, as those of the Assyrians were on the Akkadian literature.[1]

The Akkadian beliefs were, generally speaking, much the same as the Egyptian concerning countless spirits, good and bad, ghosts of the dead, and immortal gods of heaven and earth, sun, moon, sky, ocean, hell, and the wind. They believed in an eternal abode beneath sea and earth, where the dead were judged: they had myths and legends, and their ethical code was equal to that of Egypt, though we do not find in such early records the monotheism, pantheism, and philosophy of later times, while on the other hand we appear to discover the practice of human sacrifice more distinctly inculcated than it is in Egyptian records.

The Akkadians[2] considered it a great misfortune not to be buried, and the discontented ghost haunted the living. One fragment refers to those who were drowned at sea, unburied, having none to care for them, no "holy place," no libation, and no record of name. Another broken tablet (bilingual like the preceding) bears the title at the end (the titles are never

[1] Most of the tablets quoted are given by Lenormant ("Études Accadiennes," vol. iv. 1874, vol. v. 1879). These belong to the K collection of the British Museum as a rule. My translations from the cuneiform text somewhat differ in places from those of Lenormant, who is, however, one of the few leading students of Akkadian.

[2] See Boissier in "Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.," January 1903, p. 24; and Pinches, "Proc. B. A. S.," May 1901, p. 205.

at the beginning) stating it to be a "charm to secure men from the spirit of a ghost," with the note in Assyrian—"written and engraved like the original." The unbroken part of the text may be thus rendered: "Down to earth! Spirit, ghost, down! Comer back, down! It is void, the place is empty. It is void, the pit is empty, the place in earth is empty. For a ghost coming back it is empty. Like a tree cut down he will bend his face to earth. Ea has seen this man.[1] Food has been placed at his head; food was placed for his corpse. The prayer for life was prayed. O ghost, you are a son of your god, let the food placed at the head, food for the corpse, propitiate you. May your fury pass. Live, let your foot leave the land of the living. O ghost, you are a son of your god, an angry eye watches you, an evil eye watches you. . . . May the tomb god smite with the rod: may Gula bind with the great cord. May Ea, lord of the deep, drive you to your corpse. End of charm." Thus the ghost is both coaxed and threatened, and no ancient account gives a clearer idea of the early conceptions on which all the conjurations of later times were founded. The exorcisms of Babylonians, Jews, Finns, Shamans, and mediæval enchanters, are all of the same character, invoking powerful spirits to control ghosts.

But ghosts were not the only spirits feared, for many demons had no connection with dead men. They were spirits of evil, sickness, and accident, sent from the abyss as messengers of angry gods. There were seven especially who made war on the immortals, and who were driven back by the gods of sun and moon. "They are seven kings of the messengers of heaven," and they assumed the forms of savage beasts and tempests. One litany against them

[1] That is, Ea (the god judging the dead) has judged this ghost.

runs thus:[1] "They are seven. They are seven. In the hollow of the abyss they are seven. The troublers of heaven are seven. In the hollow of the abyss they grew up in hiding. The abyss multiplied them, being neither male nor female. They have no wife and bear no child, know no order or goodness, hear no prayer. They grew up as wanderers in the mountain, enemies of Ea, robbers of the gods, making stumbling-blocks in the way: they are bad, they are bad: they are seven, they are seven.—Spirit of Heaven remember, Spirit of Earth remember."

Regarding demons in general we read:[2] "They go from house to house; the door stops them not, the lock does not keep them back. They slip in as snakes, they blow through the roof as winds. They keep the wife from her husband's arms, they take the child from a man's knees. They send the free woman from her happy home. They are the voice of cursing that follows men." Again we read:[3] "They make one country assail another. They make the slave woman rebel, they drive the free woman from home. They banish the son from his father's house. They make the dove leave its cot. They make the locust fly forth: they make the swallow leave its nest: they make the cattle and sheep run away. Every day the evil demons are chasing." For they are themselves wandering spirits of disorder and misfortune. A long litany[4] describes all kinds of demons, with the refrain for each class, "Spirit of Heaven remember, Spirit of Earth remember." These include the *Utuk* of deserts, mountains, seas, and marshes; the *Gigim* (or "troubler"),

[1] Lenormant, "Études," v. pp. 122 and 81; "W. A. I.," iv. 5 and iv. 2.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 79; "W. A. I.," iv. 1.

[3] K. 4938.

[4] Oppert, in *Journal Asiatique*, January 1873; "W. A. I.," ii. 17 and 18.

who is "the wind of evil" troubling the body; the demon who "possesses" a man and makes him do evil, making the innocent impious, and the soldier a coward. They include demons of sores and pains, and those who send bad dreams, or who cause the wizard to "make an image to get hold of any one." Theirs is the power of the evil face, evil eye, evil mouth, tongue, lip, and fatal sorcery. They poison the breasts of the nurse, and cause miscarriage. They cause fever, plague, liver disease, consumption, boils, indigestion, and poisoning, as well as frost and heat and thirst. They make men die of hunger and thirst in the desert, and trouble the widow (slave or free) who has no husband, the forgotten dead, and the famishing. Good spirits are invoked against them, and charms are to be bound to the couch, the walls, and the hands of the sick. These protect also against ghosts—male or female—and against poison and philtres. The spirit who is a "son of heaven remembered by the gods" is invoked, with others, to send these demons back to a desert, or to the sea, to the Euphrates or Tigris, or to the "dark mountain of the East with slippery sides and chasms." The Hell Goddess is besought to make them come out of the body of the possessed, quarrelling with one another as they depart. The wise god (Ak) is invoked to enter the head, and man is exhorted to "seek peace by sacrifice." The Sun, "eldest child of Ocean," is finally invoked to "confirm the auguries, —Spirit of Heaven remember, Spirit of Earth remember."[1]

The power of a curse is the subject of another tablet[2]—the curse of some one unintentionally wronged bringing misfortune—"an evil cry cleaves

[1] Two copies of another text (K. 3121, 3255) conjure similar demons to "leave the man who is a son of his god."

[2] K. 65.

to him: the curse is a curse of sickness. The curse slays a man like a sheep. It makes his god punish his body. His mother goddess makes him sad. The voice that cries cloaks him as a garment, and strangles him." It can only be removed through discovery of the cause, by intercession of the sun god with his all-wise father Ea. The sun is called "the protecting hero,"[1] and is described as the "merciful one" who "raises the dead alive" (in the other world)—a "saviour" from demons. From the earliest age (that of Gudea) down to the time of Darius curses were inscribed on monuments to preserve them from any future mutilation or alteration. Talismanic images, and written charms, were also commonly used to protect buildings and men from evil spirits.[2] Figures of heroes fighting demons were carved inside doorways to frighten away fiends, or on the sides of a throne demons were represented quarrelling, while images under couches or doorsills defended the living from the dead. Such images (like Roman Penates) were invoked with libations and offered meats, with the words, "Eat and drink, children of Ea born of Ocean, for your preservation. Let no evil enter." We read also in another talismanic text:[3] "Fate. Fate. The bond not taken away: the bond of the gods never overthrown: the bond of heaven and earth which changes not. God alone is not changed. God does not let man understand. A snare not to be escaped is set against the wicked; an unchanging decree is against the wicked, whether evil spirit, demon, troubler, evil fiend, or evil god, the lurker, the ghost, the spectre, the vampire, the male or female shade, the fairy, the plague, fever, or bad sickness which is repelled by sprinkling the water of Ea." Thus devils are con-

[1] "Silik Mulu Dug." "W. A. I.," iv. 29 (1).

[2] K. 3197.

[3] K. 5015. The Sagba or Mamitu—"what is decreed."

jured with holy water, and the tablet goes on to detail curses against each kind of fiend according to the evil that it does. The plague is elsewhere exorcised[1] by placing an image of the plague-god on the stomach of the sufferer, with the words "The portrait-image is powerful."

The great gods included, besides the Spirit of Heaven and the Spirit of Earth (who were the father and mother of all), their children, the sun, moon, ocean, sky, and wind, with the terrible god of death. The dead were judged under ocean by Ea, the god of the deep and of deep wisdom. The sun gave life to them in Hades—the "land of no return"—and the pious soul is always called a "son of his god." One hymn is addressed to the Fire God[2]—"the power of famous name proclaiming fate. You mingle copper and tin, you purify gold and silver, you are the comrade of the crescent lady, you frighten the wicked by night. May you enlighten the deeds of the man who is a son of his god, may he shine as heaven, may he be pure as earth, may he be bright as the heart of heaven." Again we find Ak ("the wise"), who became the Semitic Nebo—god of the wind—addressed in a hymn as "the great messenger, bringing all secrets to light; the scribe of all that happens, holding the great pen; setting the world in order; completing a record of all that is decided for his land." In another litany the danger of a flood is exorcised:[2] "The river god rushes with fate before him fierce as a lion . . . against all the land. May the rising sun dispel the darkness, may it never reach the house, may the fate go to the desert of the highlands. Spirit of Heaven remember the fate, Spirit of Earth remember." It is a common feature of these hymns and chants that—as in later magic also—evils are conjured away to other places, as when, for instance, headache is bidden to depart

[1] K. 1284. [2] K. 44.

to the lizards in their holes, to the grasshoppers, and the birds.[1]

The Akkadians appear to have had human sacrifices of the first-born,[2] probably in times of great trouble; and regarded all misfortune as sent by angry gods. Thus we read:[3] "There is fasting in thy great city of Erech. In the house of star-gazing, the house of thine oracle, blood has been poured out like water. Fire rises in all thy lands red as the victim. Lady, I have put the evil man under the yoke. Thy hand breaks the power of the foe like a reed. I wrest not the law. I do not boast of myself. Day and night I wither like a flower. I am thy servant, remembering thee." The confession of sin is also found in long litanies, of which one bears the title, "Lament of a Contrite Heart."[4] In this we have the following passages: "How long, O Mother Istar, knowing the unknown, will thy heart be wroth with me, making a narrow way for men that none can know?" "O Lord, thou wilt not reject thy servant. Vouchsafe to take his hand in the waters of the tempest. Turn away in mercy the sin I sinned. Let the wind bear away the fault I committed. Wring out as a cloth my great shame." These litanies, or penitential psalms, as they have been called, are very long and wearisome, and are addressed to a god and a goddess. There is, indeed, no true Monotheism to be discovered in Akkadian literature, but only what Max Müller calls "Henotheism," or the selection of one god out of the pantheon. In such cases he is praised as the greatest, and the singer asks, "Who is like thee among gods?" but the deity so invoked is not always the same.

The oldest Akkadian texts, probably before 3000 B.C., are votive tablets and objects, given to the temples

[1] K. 3169. [2] K. 5139. [3] K. 4608.
[4] "W. A. I.," iv. 10, lines 25 to 31 and 35 to 44.

in recognition of the "preservation alive" of some monarch. These often contain historic information. Others, at Tell Loh, date from about 2800 B.C., and record the endowments of the temples by various successive kings. In a text by Gudea we also learn that this shrine was set up on ground that had never been defiled by a dead body. We have thus very early evidences of the rites and enrichment of temples and priests, and of the vestments worn by the latter, which are of great importance for comparative study.

The Akkadians also had many mythical stories. Though now only known in Semitic translation, there is little doubt that the story of Sargina ("the founder king") floating in his ark on the Euphrates, like Moses on the Nile, or like Perseus in Greece, Darab in Persia, and the twins—Romulus and Remus—in Rome, is of Akkadian origin, as are the legends of Gilgamas, "the sun hero," or Babylonian Hercules. Another fragment[1] refers to a luck child "who had neither father nor mother; who knew neither his father nor his mother. He drank, quenching his thirst in the street gutter; he snatched food from the dogs and crows." A wise man adopted him, and made a seal mark on the soles of his feet: he was educated as a scribe, and (in the end which is lost) no doubt became a famous hero.

This Akkadian religion, with its ghosts, fiends, gods, and heroes, its magic and its psalms, was not confined to Chaldea. The Hittite bas-reliefs show us similar beliefs in Syria and Asia Minor at a very early age. The basalt texts of Hamath seem clearly to be votive inscriptions "for the life"[2] of some king. At Mer'ash, in Syria, we have a rude bas-relief cut in rock representing the mother goddess and child—like Isis and Horus—and this is perhaps the oldest

[1] "W. A. I.," ii. 9, col. 2.

[2] *Til-ka*, "for life," in Hittite.

Madonna group in the world. At Babylon itself a Hittite text accompanies the pigtailed thunder god with hammer and thunderbolts. At Ibreez, in Lycaonia, we have a gigantic deity holding corn and grapes, and the robes of the worshipper are adorned with the familiar *Swastica* symbol. At Carchemish we find the winged, naked Istar. At Boghaz Keui (Pterium), in Pontus, the rock shrine is guarded by demon figures like those of Japanese temple doors, and the walls are carved with a great procession of gods and genii. To the left the heaven god stands on men's shoulders with a band of male figures behind him. He meets the procession of the Earth goddess (Ma), who stands facing him to the right, on the back of a lion. Behind her are the twins (Sun and Moon), on a double-headed eagle, and the sun god on a lion, while females complete the second procession. These most archaic sculptures are prototypes of the later Assyrian representations (at Bavian and Samala) of gods standing on beasts like the Indian deities.[1] Even far west in Lydia we have a seal with figures of gods, one of whom is two-headed like Janus, presenting a cross to his worshippers and a flail to the wicked in Hades, and thus explaining the double aspect of the Etruscan god of peace and war. In Etruria itself one of the most remarkable figures is that of Charon ("the evil god"), who is always pictured with the grinning mask which belongs to Bes in Egypt, and to all demons in Chaldea. This widespread Mongol religion has been noticed in considerable detail, because it represents the oldest known Asiatic system, and appears to lie at the root of later beliefs, not only in Babylonia, Assyria, and

[1] In the treaty with Rameses II., the Hittites invoke Set (or Sutekh) as "ruler of heaven," with "a thousand gods and goddesses of the land of the Hittites," and with gods of "hills and rivers," "the great sea, the winds, and the clouds.'

Persia, but also in Etruria and in Greece, where many Akkadian figures and legends were adopted later. Akkadian magic also seems to form the basis of the mediæval sorcery which claimed a Babylonian origin.

iv. Babylonia.—The religion of the Semitic race in Babylonia, Assyria, Canaan, and Phœnicia alike, was founded on that of the Akkadians. In some cases the Akkadian names for the gods were retained, and though in others Semitic terms were substituted, the characters of the deities were unchanged.[1] The Assyrians in time came to regard Assur ("the most blessed"), who was their national god, as supreme over others; but he was represented as an archer, with eagle's wings and tail, in a circle—the old emblem of the sun-god in Egypt, Phœnicia, and Chaldea, and among the Hittites, having been the winged sun. The contrast between the lowest superstitious belief in ghosts, demons, wizards, and charms on the one hand, or conceptions of duty, sin, and punishment by immortal gods on the other, is observable in early Semitic systems just as it is in Akkadian texts. It is not till about the seventh century B.C. that the old deities of nature are formed into a regular pantheon, and regarded as rulers of the planets, by the Assyrians. In the west the local names of the gods are distinctive, but the characters of the great rulers of heaven, hell, and ocean, of sun, moon, sky, earth, and the wind are the same. Even in Syria we find the Akkadian names of Tamzi, Istar, Nergal, and

[1] *Anu*, "heaven," *Istaru*, "light-maker," *Nirgalu*, "King death," *Namtaru*, "fate," *Marduku*, "sun disk," *Ea*, "ocean spirit," are Akkadian names with the Semitic nominative in *u* added. *Ilu*, "god," *Ilatu*, "goddess," *Belu*, "lord," *Beltu*, "lady," *Rimmunu*, "sky," *Samsu*, "sun," *Sinu*, "moon," *Nabu*, "swelling" or "wind," are Semitic names.

Dagon still surviving.[1] The only new feature that has been discovered in excavating Canaanite cities has been the use of phallic emblems at a very early period, and these appear also to have been common in Chaldea among Akkadians.

The Semitic tablets which record magical formulæ are very numerous in the museums. One of these gives a series of charms[2] to repel ghosts. A sort of sour gruel is to be poured from the hoof of a black ox with the words: "O dead ones whose dwellings are the mounds . . . why do you appear to me? I have not gone to Cutha to choose a ghost. Why do you haunt me? The queen of destruction, Allatu, queen of heaven's peak, is the scribe of the gods, her pen is of lapis and sapphire." Or, otherwise, lead rolls with spells on them may be buried, or a knotted rope bound round the brow of the ghost-seer, the knots sprinkled with dust from an old tomb, an anthill, etc. Or you may make an image of a living man of clay, and wash it in pure water and anoint it, making also an image of a dead man, and burying it under the shade of a tree. The former is laid in the sun with the words, "Light is on thee, O shadow, the buried one is gone to his place." Another formula is potent against a witch,[3] including the words, "May Sinu (the moon-god) destroy thy body, and may he cast thee into the lake of water and fire." Charms to cure sickness are also very numerous, or what is called "sympathetic magic," which is only a kind of dumb show representing the wishes of the

[1] *Nergal* is noticed in a Phœnician text, *Dagon* was the Akkadian *Da-gan* (probably "man-fish"). The Syrian Gods included *El*, "heaven," *Baalath*, "earth," *Shamash*, "sun," *Yerekh*, "moon," *Resheph* (or *Hadad*), "the sky," *Dagon*, "ocean," *Nergal*, "hell," and *Nebo*, "wind," with *'Ashtoreth* or *Istar*, the moon and mother.

[2] See R. Campbell Thompson, in "Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.," November 1906, pp. 219–27.

[3] "British Museum Guide," 1900, p. 64.

victim. These spells have survived to quite recent times in Europe; and the idea that when a body remains unburied (in some place unknown or that cannot be reached), and the ghost in consequence haunts the living, it can be laid by burying an image, was common in Scotland a few centuries ago; for miniature coffins, with dolls in them, have been found buried in consecrated ground at the ruined chapel of St. Antony, on Arthur's Seat, and are said to have represented sailors drowned at sea.

Equally numerous are omen tablets of every kind, the omens being taken from the flight of birds, or doings of dogs, pigs, snakes, scorpions; from monstrous births, entrails of sacrifices, astrological aspects, the weather, lots, accidents, etc., just as among the Etruscans and Romans. Miraculous interventions of the gods were firmly credited, as we see from a poem in regular metre which refers to an Elamite invasion (probably about 650 B.C.), when the impious desecrator of a temple was slain by the god Bel, who appeared in glory. Visions were also ascribed to divine suggestions, and the seer and the prophet are noticed in the earliest historic texts. The following psalm or prayer refers to such belief:[1]

"Lord God, let my lamentations be quieted. (Hear) from (heaven) merciful Lord of comfort. Bring me safety on the day appointed for death. Be gracious to me, O my Goddess, and hear my lament. May my fault, my wickedness, my error, my sin, be forgiven. May the weight be taken from me. May the seven winds carry away my groans. May I break from sin. May the bird fly forth in heaven. May the fish escape the net; may the river carry it away. . . . Make my face to shine as gold . . . let me lay thine offerings in the court of thine altar. Forgive my sin and watch over me. Be above me, and may a happy dream come:

[1] Lenormant, "Études Accadiennes," v. p. 162; "W. A. I.," iv. 66. 2.

may the dream I dream be happy; may the dream I dream be true; make the dream I dream a good omen. Let Makhir, god of dreams, stand over my head. Let me also enter the high house, the temple of the gods, the abode of the Lord. Let me join Marduk the merciful, for happiness, the happiness in his hands, to thy glory. Let me praise thy god-ship. Let the men of my city celebrate thy great deeds."

Fragments of the sacred poems and legends of Babylonia show us the Semitic ideas as to creation, and concerning mythology, all apparently of Akkadian origin. A set of seven tablets described the creation by Anu (god of heaven) of the gods, the earth, stars, moon, and living creatures, and probably (as Alexander Polyhistor relates) of man compounded of clay and of the blood of Bel, the earth god.[1] This cosmogony appears to be very ancient, since the six days of creation were known also to the Etruscans. The Flood story occurs in the legend of the twelve labours of Gilgamas ("the sun hero"), and this was borrowed by the Greeks from a Semitic source; Deucalion—the Greek Noah—bearing apparently a Semitic name meaning "lord of the ship." Out of these twelve tablets, the first, fourth, and fifth are lost; but the story of Gilgamas given by Ælian probably represents the account of his birth in the first lost tablet, while the representation of the hero slaying the lion (common on cylinders) indicates the subject of the fourth or fifth episode. The whole legend gives us clearly the originals of various well-known myths, which the Greeks took probably from the civilised tribes of Asia Minor. Gilgamas was the child of a princess shut up (like Danäe) in a tower. He was exposed on a mountain,[2] and an eagle carried him to a

[1] Lenormant, "Origines de l'Histoire," 1880, pp. 494–506.

[2] Ælian, "Hist. Anim.," xii. 2. See "Records of the Past," 1891, vol. v.

gardener, who brought him up. He became king of Erech in Chaldea, and was troubled by a terrible vision which could only be explained by Ea-bani ("Ea's spirit"), a man-bull living in the forest, who becomes his comrade, but is mortal, like the dark Twin Brother of Greek mythology.[1] In the sixth tablet we find Istar wooing the hero—as in the Greek borrowed legend of Adonis—and he reminds her of the fate of former lovers, including Tabulu, whose own dogs tore him—as in the story of Actæon. The angry Istar sends a monster bull, whom Gilgamas and Ea-bani slay. The hero goes forth to seek immortality, and reaches a magic garden in the sea—like that of the Hesperides—where jewelled forests are guarded by scorpion men and giants. He slays a giant in an eastern forest, and goes over the desert in search of Ea-bani, who has been slain by the gadfly. Gilgamas becomes leprous, and his hairs (or rays) fall off: he is ferried over the "waters of death" by the "servant of Ea," and reaches the abode of Tamzi ("the sun spirit"), where he is told the story of the Flood, and then bathed in the "water of life." Finally the ghost of Ea-bani is sent to him after agonised supplications for his life, and the pair return from the underworld to the city of Erech.

No less famous is the legend of the descent of Istar to Hades, which begins thus: "To the Land of No Return, the region below, Istar, daughter of the moon, set her mind: the daughter of the moon determined to go to the house of corruption, the dwelling of the great devourer, to the house whose entry has no exit, to the road whose way has no return, to the place whose entrance shuts out the light, where they eat dust, and devour mud: its light is unseen in darkness; the ghosts like birds flap their wings; door and bolt are thick with dust." Such is the picture of Sheol,

[1] The friendly man-bull in a forest, and descending a well, is found in a Calmuc tale. Gubernatis, "Zoological Mythology," 1872, i. p. 129.

where Istar is deprived of all her jewels given to her by Tammuz (the sun) on her wedding day, but is finally washed in the water of life, and restored to glory —a clear myth of the twenty-eight days of the early lunar month. Other legends include that of Etana, carried—like Ganymede—by an eagle to heaven, and of the god Zu ("the learned"), who stole the tablet of fate from heaven, just as the Veda is stolen in Indian mythology. In addition to these myths we also find, in later times, fables like those of Æsop, on tablets from Nineveh, including those of the Fox and the Sun, the Eagle and the Serpent, with that of the Horse and the Bull—a poem in metre contrasting the lives of the soldier and the farmer.

The official religion of the temples is represented by records of ritual, of sacrifices, and endowments, fasts and feasts. The fifteenth day of the month was a "Sabbath," or "day of rest indoors," when all business was forbidden. The hymns and prayers were regularly prescribed: incense and libations were customary features of the services. Holy water from the temple at Sippara was purchased by pilgrims; but the temples also contained Kedeshoth or "consecrated women," like those of India and Greece; while in days of great trouble human sacrifices were offered, as by all Semitic peoples down to late times. The king was regarded as a divine personage, and was the high priest of the gods: the superstitious character of Assyrian beliefs is witnessed by the famous prayer of Assur-bani-pal, which is thus rendered:[1] "O Rimmon, prince of heaven and earth, by whose command men were created, speak the word and let the gods aid thee. Try thou my cause, and grant me a favourable judgment. For I, Assur-bani-pal, am thy servant, and the son of my god Assur and of my

[1] See "British Museum Guide," 1900, p. 66, K. 2808+K. 9490.

goddess 'Ashtoreth. I make my petition to thee, and ascribe praise to thee, because of evil after an eclipse of the moon, and the hostility of the powers of heaven, and evil portents in my palace and in my land: because of evil bewitchment, and unclean disease, transgression and iniquity, and sin in my body; and because of an evil spectre that haunts me. Accept thou the lifting up of my hands: heed my prayer; set me free from the spell that binds me; do away with my sin; let any evil threatening my life be averted. Let a good spirit be ever at my head. May the god and goddess of mankind be gracious to me. Let me live by thy command. Let me bow down and extol thy greatness."

This faith, however primitive and ignorant, yet inculcated an ethical system in which truth and justice are regarded as duties.[1] The king is bidden to rule according to law, and to heed his counsellors and the commands of the gods, while all who take bribes are to be cast into prison. From the days of 'Ammurabi to those of Assur-bani-pal, the just and loyal government of the empire was maintained by all great kings of Babylon or of Assyria. The religious ideas and customs remained unchanged for more than two thousand years, and the later Phœnician texts show similar beliefs in Syria. Thus Yehumelek (perhaps as early as 600 B.C.) built a temple to his goddess, and says on the dedication stone, "Because she heard my voice and did me good, therefore I call on her. May Baalath of Gebal bless Yehumelek, and grant him life, and make his days and years many in Gebal, for that he is a just king; and may the Lady Baalath of Gebal grant him favour in the eyes of the Elohim, and of the people of the land." Yet later (in the third century B.C.) the coffin of Eshmunazar of Sidon

[1] "British Museum Guide," p. 48, Tablet of Precepts, D. T. i.

is inscribed with a curse against the desecrator, and declares the ancient belief in Sheol, and in the Rephaim or ghosts. Belief thus crystallised, among nations who adored many gods even if they regarded one as supreme, had attained a permanence that excluded higher ideas, for which we must look in Greece, in India, and among the Hebrews.

v. The West Aryans.—From the primitive ideas of the Turanian and Semitic races we may turn to consider those of the early Aryans, concerning which there has been much difference of opinion. We may regard it as certain that they held the animistic beliefs which are common to all mankind, long before they separated from each other (East and West) and even before they migrated North from the Asiatic cradle of the three great stocks. As among the Semitic and Mongolic races, so also among Aryans, the local names of the gods are very various; and little help is found in comparing those of the various Aryan nations, the principal comparison being between the Vedic and Greek deities, or between those nations which were nearest to each other. These, however, indicate the common origin of beliefs among eastern and western Aryans,[1] while certain very ancient myths are not only common to all branches of the Aryans, but often also to the Turanian and Semitic races as well. The sun as a dragon-slayer is found in all Aryan countries, and Marduk in Babylon slays the griffin Tiamat, the mother of

[1] The most apparent parallels include the Greek Zeus (Sk. *Diaush*), Eos (*Usha*), Orpheus (*Arbhu*), Hestia (*Vasu*), Argynnis (*Arjuna*), Echidna (*Ahi*), Hephaistos (*Yavishtha*), Phoroneus (*Bhuranyu*), Prometheus (*Pramātha*), Helios (*Surya*), Euruphassa (*Urvasi*), Arktos (*Arksha*), Triton (*Trita*), Ouranos (*Varuna*): the Latin Mars (*Marut*): the Scandinavian Frey (*Prithivi*), who is the Latin Priapus, god of "fruitfulness": the Slav Perkunas (*Parjanya*), the thunderer.

storms. The story of the child exposed to beasts, or on the river, is again Babylonian, though found in Rome, in Japan, and in Persia.[1] The world tree, in a paradise of the sea, is equally ancient. In Persia it grows in ocean, and is guarded by the Kar-fish —a gigantic sturgeon. Among the Indians it is one of the "trees of life" on a Paradise mountain—as also in China. In Scandinavia it is the world-tree Iggdrasil—a gigantic ash whose roots are in hell, and its topmost branches in heaven: on them rests the eagle, which is the emblem of Zeus, who sits on the heaven tree as represented on an Etruscan mirror. Other ideas, more distinctively Aryan, include the rainbow bridge to heaven, found among the Norse and in Persia; the heavenly maidens (or white clouds) common to the same two mythologies; also the conception of a good god opposed to an evil spirit (as in Egypt) which we find in the Bielbog ("white god") and Zernebog ("black god") among Slavs, as well as in Ahura Mazdā ("the most wise lord") and Angro-mainyus ("the angry mind") in Persia. The idea of successive ages of world history is again common to Greeks and Hindus, as is that of gods or heroes born of virgin mothers by divine fathers, which we also find among Mongols. The belief in a reincarnate hero is common to East and West, as represented by Zoroaster in Persia, and by many Hindu legends, as well as by the Norse Baldur, the Keltic Arthur, or the Teutonic Frederic Redbeard, and Holger Danske in Denmark. This Messianic expectation is indeed traceable earlier among the Persians than it is among the Hebrews. These comparisons seem to show that mythology, as well as animism, was developed before the division of the two great Aryan families; but on the other hand we cannot doubt that the Greeks borrowed

[1] See Chap. II. p. 77.

myths from both Turanian and Semitic peoples in Asia Minor, and the Romans from the Turanian Etruscans in Italy.[1]

The Etruscan gods, bearing Mongol names, survive as "folletti" in Tuscany still,[2] mingled with other (Aryan) figures, mainly Roman, but sometimes perhaps Gothic, as in the case of the Dusio, or "deuce," an evil demon. The frescoes in Etruscan tombs show good spirits painted red, and evil ones (under Charon, the "god of evil") painted black. The ghost is taken to Hades on a "death horse," which is also the supporter of the hell goddess, according to the Babylonian system, as represented on a well-known bronze tablet from Palmyra. The Etruscan[3] cosmogony, representing a creation in six days each of a thousand years, is similar to that of the Hebrews, and of the later Persians, as well as of the Babylonians. Cicero also[4] compares Etruscan auguries with those of the Chaldeans. The Romans took many myths from the Etruscans, and the word "Lars" is probably non-Aryan;[5] but other legends are apparently Aryan, such as that of Cacus detaining the herds of Hercules in his cavern, which recalls the story of Indra (in the Veda), whose cattle were stolen by the Panis. Roman beliefs are very similar to those already described, including ghosts, demons, hell, the feeding of the dead at the Lemuralia with black beans, the drowning of

[1] In Greek, Herakles is perhaps the Akkadian *Er-gal*, "big man": Kentaur the Mongol *Kan-tor*, "man-beast": Amazon the Akkadian *Ama-zun*, "woman warrior." The Greek loans from Semitic speech include Melikertes, (Phœnician *Melkarth*), Kadmos (*Kedem*, "east"), Europa (*Ereb*, "west"), the Kabiri (Babylonian *Kabiri*, "great ones"), and several others which are less certain. Adonis was mourned in Athens just as he was in Syria (Plutarch, "Nicias"). See my "Syrian Stone Lore," 1896, p. 148.

[2] Leland, "Etruscan Roman Remains," 1892.

[3] Suidas, *s.v.* "Tyrrhenia."

[4] Cicero, "De Divinat.," i.

[5] *Lar*, "lord," as in Kassite.

wicker images thrown from the Sublician bridge, the omens, leaden tablets, magic papyri, and philtres, with other well-known superstitions. Like all Aryans, the Romans worshipped the sacred fire, guarded by the girl priests of Vesta; and the priests at Soracte walked unharmed over glowing embers like modern Dervishes. We find no new features in their beliefs till later times, when the Greek Plutarch taught [1] that all demons—good and bad—were the ministers of the supreme god. After the foundation of the empire many foreign cults entered Italy, especially that of Isis and Serapis from Egypt, and the debased worship of Mithra from Pontus. Much of the early Roman cultus was derived from the Greeks of southern Italy; and the Greek orgies were also celebrated in Rome.

It is not necessary to enter deeply into the mythology and folk-lore of the Slavs, Teutons, or Scandinavians. Their beliefs are of the same general character; but the Norse Eddas are only known in a very late form after the introduction of Christianity, and the Keltic legends are equally subject to suspicion of corruption by borrowing from the Bible—especially as regards the Flood story. The folk-lore of Europe, to which so much attention has been given, presents confused survivals—among Christianised peasants—of the old pagan superstitions; and, by tracing such to their origin in Babylonia, we escape from the later perversions, and go back to much older and more reliable sources.[2]

In Greece we have the same mingling of original Aryan mythology with legends borrowed from Asia; the same early superstitions, and later belief in a supreme god; and the same secret rites—or mysteries

[1] Like Maximus the Platonist.

[2] For Aryan folk-lore see Forlong's "Faiths of Man," 3 vols. 1906; Cox, "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," 1882; or Frazer's "Golden Bough," 1890—as far as his facts are concerned.

—which are found among all savage nations. At Athens, on the seventh day of Thargelion (the mid-summer month), a man and a woman—usually slaves or captives—were annually sacrificed as human scape-goats, just as in Mexico or Peru. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia is possibly as historic as that of Jephthah's daughter, since children were offered by all early races in times of great trouble. The great Eleusis mysteries celebrated the rape and restoration of Persephone ("the seed in the furrow"), who answered to the Indian Sita. We do not know certainly what the secret teaching at these rites really was. Christians who were initiated say that the emblem shown was a phallus, and it seems probable that the initiated renounced all popular belief in the old gods, and were taught that the only realities were the male and female principles in nature, in which the Hindu, Chinese, and Japanese philosophers equally believed. But Cicero says that the teaching was comforting both as regards this life and regarding the hereafter. Most mysteries have always either referred to matters which it was not decent to explain in public, or to secret sceptical views which it was dangerous to avow in face of an ignorant and fanatical popular creed. The real contribution of Greece to human progress consisted neither in her mythology nor in her mysteries, but in the search for "wisdom" and real knowledge by her famous philosophers. Yet among these also we must recognise, when studying them by the light of modern science, limitations of the most marked character, due to preconceptions as to nature which were entirely misleading.

The Greek looked on the ancient beliefs of Asia with fresh eyes. Greek sages, in the sixth century B.C., and for nearly a thousand years after, enlarged their experience by travel abroad; and the first philosophers, while they discovered that under many

names the gods of all lands were ever the same, and the savage superstitions of the barbarians the same as those of their own peasantry, became aware that the popular ideas had no sound foundation in facts, and that the realities of existence were yet unknown. They endeavoured to understand "being and beings" (as Aristotle says), but their ignorance of physics, and their unconscious prejudices due to education, made it impossible for them to advance beyond very crude conceptions of nature. Thales and his disciples sought to find the origin of matter and of life in an element, or in elements, such as water and heat, or air, or fire, but knew nothing of the real nature of these substances and forces, though they dimly perceived that the universe was a single and infinite substance, animated by a single will. The great foreign religions, which they found to have created ideas far in advance of their own, were that of Persia (spreading to Ionia in the sixth century B.C.) and that of Egypt. From the former they may have learned the idea of immortality, from the latter they might take (as we have already seen) the doctrines of transmigration, and pantheism. But the fresh mind placed a new complexion on the ancient dogmas; and gradually the Greek sages came to think that, while Reason was the best guide, yet—as it depended on imperfect senses—it was impossible for man to understand even the world in which he dwelt, and still less the mysteries of the beginning and the end. Our knowledge of the early philosophers often depends on the statements of much later writers. Pythagoras of Samos, who formed the school of Crotona in Italy, may have been the first teacher of the West (about 530 B.C.), and an ascetic who believed in the Infinite Unity, and in transmigration. But it is possible that Iamblikhos attributed to him—some nine hundred years after—the ideas of a latter Indian Budha-guru, or

"teacher of wisdom." The new ideas, however, culminated in the teaching of Plato and of Aristotle, and the earlier attempts are less important. The grandfather of Pythagoras is said to have been drowned because his book on the "Mystic Reason" was judged to be atheistic; but the idea of a *Logos* continued to be studied by others. To Pythagoras it was Light: to Parmenides it was Divine Reason: to Herakleitos it was Heat. In the fifth century B.C. the belief in indestructible and eternal matter following immutable laws was proclaimed: in the fourth the extreme of scepticism was reached by Pyrrho, and a hundred years later the Stoics began to abandon speculations as to the unknown, and confined themselves to the teaching of better ethics.

On Plato and Aristotle the later philosophies of Europe are founded, and neither Hume nor Kant (who was his disciple) added any really new facts. On Hume and Kant modern pre-scientific speculations are based, and Schopenhauer adds only a perverted form of the later Buddhist pessimism. The enthusiasm for the two greatest of the Greeks, which was roused in the Renaissance age by the study of their works, still dominates the thoughts of those to whom science is little known, but more advanced thinkers have already perceived that Plato and Aristotle alike are subject to limitations of a very serious character, due to ignorance and preconceived opinions natural to their age and from which they sought in vain to escape.

In Plato especially we find the higher thought of Socrates—the first cynic or street preacher of Greece—struggling with the old conceptions of transmigration and a corporeal soul. He discarded the popular superstitions, and thought that the fear of Hades, and the savage mythology of Homer, should not be taught to the young.[1] He believed that God is the Universal

[1] "Republic," Book III.

Intelligence, and that the soul freed from the body "stands up" immortal. But the soul is still "the child within"[1]; and, since God causes only what is good, Plato is forced to suppose that man, after punishment for his sins in hell, is allowed a second life on earth, and is alone responsible for the choice he then makes after the experience of his first existence—as we learn from the parable which closes the "Republic." Plato desires to take a general view of every subject, and the "idea" (or class) he regards as real and enduring, while the "phenomena" are transient incidents—God being the eternal thinker of passing thoughts. But when he endeavours to prove that the soul is immortal because it is not destroyed by evil[2] (which is that which causes dissolution), we see that his argument is based on assumptions, and hampered by the conception of the corporeal nature of the soul; and we are inclined to agree with Cicero's suspicion that Plato did not really understand what he meant. His assertion that the human soul retains its consciousness was as incapable of actual proof as was the assertion of Demokritos that the soul dies with the body. His arguments from the general to the particular could only be sound if his knowledge of the particulars on which to generalise was accurate and true. Much as we may admire the ideas which he attributes to Socrates, we can never regard Plato as either a man of science or a man of practical experience. His ideal Republic would—he thought—become practicable in time, but it never became so, and it was founded on an entirely unnatural basis representing the ethics of a savage. He proposes to delude the ignorant masses by outward show of religion, and to breed a ruling class like cattle, extinguishing selfishness and jealousy by permitting wives to be common to all of the caste. He thus involves himself

[1] Phædo. [2] "Republic," Book X.

in clumsy attempts to define the limits of relationship, and Aristotle practically upsets the whole of this absurd reversion to barbarism by his remark that it is natural to man and beast alike to pair,[1] and jealously to keep their own offspring to themselves. Plato was not a man of practical experience, any more than he was a clearly logical thinker like his great disciple. His patriotism extended to the conception of a united Greece, but he still regarded it as a duty to hate the Persian barbarians.[2] He thought that the ideal state would be one ruled by philosophers who accepted his visionary and reactionary proposals; but it is clear to us now that Plato's Republic would have gone to pieces in a year, in spite of the education of both sexes in science, music, and dialectic. He conceives no other escape from alternations of tyranny and anarchy such as he witnessed in the contemporary states of Greece; but the state which he proposed to create has no claim to the character of good wool, dyed with a fast colour, to which he likens it. The soul, he says, fastens on truth as something seen clearly in a bright light, and remains uncertain of that which is only seen in dimness. But the light may sometimes be only deceptive mirage, or coloured by the prism of prejudice.

Aristotle, though the pupil of Plato, had no doubt much better opportunities of studying actual science, and statesmanship, after he had been made the tutor of Alexander the Great by Philip of Macedon; and, as his interests lay more in the actual study of men and of nature than in speculation on the mysteries of existence, he became the real father of Greek science. His logical power, and careful definition of the meaning that he attached to words, led to clearer thought, though he too starts with assumptions many of which

[1] "Ethics," VIII. vii.; Plato, "Republic," V.

[2] "Republic," V.

are now discarded, or shown to be doubtful. Thus he supposes that animals have no reasoning powers at all, and he still regards the soul as corporeal, though "small in size."[1] God is the Universal Intelligence: the soul includes a reasoning and an unreasoning element, and has feeling, intelligence, and appetites. Its intelligence is both active and passive; and truth is the outcome of its logical powers. On such postulates he founds his study of "being and beings," matter and forms, the origin of motion, reason and right, energy and purpose, seeking to answer the question "What is Being?"[2] He regards heredity as only an excuse brought forward by those who fail in duty.[3] He teaches free will, and regards man (when not incapacitated by dense ignorance or disease) as solely responsible for his future. Thus his Ethics are founded on the sternest teaching of justice—the law of the due share—while pity and love are regarded as passions only, and as inferior to the virtues which are, in each case, the mean between defect and excess.[4] He says that no man can make a friend of his slave; and he can find no Greek words to express virtues which we call modesty, gentleness, and courtesy. He insists on intuitive ideas, not regarding these as due to heredity; and he makes a strange triple division of substance,[5] as immortal, mortal, and active—that is, possessed of power, energy, and purpose. For he knew not that no form of matter is durable for ever, and the idea of energy is confused by the belief that the soul itself is substance or matter. He supposes that the dead remain conscious of the lives of their friends,[6] but that they can only contemplate these

[1] "Nicomachian Ethics," X. vii. 10.
[2] "Metaphysics," VII. i.
[3] "Ethics," VII. vi. 6.
[4] *Ibid.* II. iv., v.; VII. xi. 6.
[5] "Metaphysics," XII. vi., vii.; IX. viii.
[6] "Ethics," I. xi.

without power to interfere. Happiness, he says, is the aim of ethics and politics, but it must be the calm happiness of the soul, and of the man who—free from actual needs—lives calmly contemplative, unswayed by passion though not possessing the "blessedness" of the gods. "Each," he says, "wishes for good for himself more than for the good of others." "Each desires to be loved rather than to love," and desires to be honoured by the powerful "because of hope."[1] The great compassion of the Buddha, and the infinite love of Jesus, thus seem to be entirely unimagined by the greatest mind among the Greeks.

vi. Persia.—Our first authentic information as to Persian religion is derived from the cuneiform records of the successors of Cyrus, which are written in three languages (Persian, Babylonian, and Turanian), and in three different varieties of the script. The Turanians of West Persia, and the Aryan Persians alike, derived their characters from Babylon—and not apparently from Assyria—and the Persians simplified the Babylonian syllabary (as early as 520 B.C. at least), reducing it to a rude alphabet of forty-four signs in all.

The descendants of Hakamanish, as already related,[2] were distinguished for their tolerance of the various religions of their subjects. We know nothing definite of the religion of Cyrus himself. The Babylonians claimed that he was a worshipper of Bel, Marduk, and Nebo, and that he restored to their shrines certain gods of Sumir and Akkad whose images the last king of Babylon (Nabu-nahid) had removed.[3] The monument[4] which was erected close to the tomb of Cyrus

[1] "Ethics," VIII. vii., viii.

[2] Chap. III., p. 98.

[3] "Cylinder Text of Cyrus." See "Trans. Bib. Arch. Soc.," 1879, ii. p. 148; "Records of the Past," New Series, v. p. 164.

[4] Jackson, "Persia Past and Present," 1906, p. 281.

(at Pasargadæ), and on which some later king inscribed the words, "I am Cyrus the king, descendant of Hakamanish," represents a four-winged god—like the Assyrian bas-reliefs—but the head-dress is like that of Egyptian deities. The carved stylobates, and doorways, at Persepolis also show the strong Semitic influence that permeated Persia in the time of Darius I. and of his successors. Commercial tablets of the reign of Artaxerxes I., and of later monarchs, show not only the prosperity of a mixed Persian-Babylonian race, but also the common use of the Aramaic alphabet from which the later Parthian, and Pehlevi, letters were derived. Darius I., as we have seen, rebuilt the temples of Egypt, and in his inscriptions we find no notice of a sacred law (or Avesta)[1]; while he became, as we know, the enemy of an usurping Magus in whose time (522 B.C.) the temples were destroyed by the fanaticism of this priestly class in its last attempt at rebellion against the growing influences of foreign civilisation.

The inscriptions of Darius show us a very simple belief in Ahura-mazdā ("the all-wise Lord") as the greatest of the gods—"the Aryan god"—with insistence on "the right way," and on the duty of telling the truth, and detestation of the "lie" (*Drauga*) or "falsehood." They do not contain any allusion to

[1] The question whether the Avesta (*Abastam*, "law") is noticed by Darius I. depends on the absence of a single stroke in a single sign; and Professor Jackson ("Persia," p. 205) appears to have settled the true reading to be *arstam*, "right." Dr. Oppert ("Langue des Mèdes," 1879, p. 155) has read into the Turanian version of the Behistān text of Darius I. a reference to both the Avesta and the Zend (or "comment"); but the passage seems to be better translated thus: "I made other Aryan texts, which was not done before, both for record and information, and for prayer; also translations, which I composed and wrote. I had tablets made, and I restored old tablets, in all countries, that the inhabitants might understand." This we see from the existing texts to be true. The "prayers" noticed are no doubt those for prosperity which occur in the extant inscriptions.

Ahriman (Angro-mainyus), or to Zoroaster (Zarathustra), or to any of the distinctive beliefs and customs of the Persians.[1] Darius says that after Gomatta the Magus "had seduced both the Persians and the Medes," "Ahura-mazdā (Ormuzd) gave me the kingdom"; and again, "the great Ahura-mazdā is the greatest of gods"; "who created this earth, who created this heaven, who created man, who gave good things to man, who made Darius king." "O man, think not the command of Ahura-mazdā to be evil, leave not the right way, be not a sinner." "Ahura-mazdā and the other gods helped me because I was not malignant, not a liar, not wicked." "If you do not transgress this edict may Ahura-mazdā be your friend, may your family be numerous, and your life long." There is nothing said about resurrection or immortality, about the Haoma drink or the angels. But when Artaxerxes II. (after 405 B.C.) repeats the ancient formula above quoted as to the Creator, he adds the names of Mithra and Anahita to that of Ahura-mazdā, saying, "I have placed Anahita and Mithra in this palace. May Ahura-mazdā, Anahita and Mithra guard me." Thus it would seem that the royal religion gradually became more formal, and that the Magi gradually attained to a priestly dominance which was not recognised in the times of Cyrus and Darius, a century before.

The religion of the Magi, or "great ones," who were the Persian priests, appears to have been that common also to the Aryan shepherds[2] whose poets composed the ancient hymns of the Rig-veda or "teaching of praise." But, as these Eastern tribes pushed on towards India, while the Persians pushed west and came under the influence of the Mongols

[1] Spiegel, "Die Altpersischen Keilinschriften," 1881. Recent corrections refer only to small details.

[2] Haug, "Essays," 1862.

of Elam and (later) of the Assyrians and Babylonians, divergences of language and belief naturally arose. The East Aryans called a god a "Deva," while the Persians used the word "Bagha" like the Medes, and applied the former term to demons, and finally to devils. But many names and sacerdotal terms remained common to both branches of the Iranian race who called themselves Aryans or "strong men."[1] Both alike believed that the righteous would enjoy eternal life in heaven with the gods. Even the Persian practice of giving the dead to dogs and vultures—which was common to the Mongols of Central Asia—finds an echo in the Hindu custom of feeding the crows with rice after a funeral. Many of these ideas were of great antiquity among Aryans generally; and the Haoma or Soma drink was like the Scandinavian "mead," the drink of the gods, or "immortal" ambrosia of Greeks. The legend of Indra's cows stolen by the Panis appears (in Persia) in the great hymn to Mithra, whose cows cried, "When will he turn us back to the right way from the den of the fiend where we were driven?"

Such apparently was the faith of the Magi when Zoroaster appeared. Persian traditions differ as to whether he was born in Media, or came west from Balkh, but the later Persians held that he first

[1] The Persian Ahura is the Sanskrit *Asura*, "Lord" or "God"; and Haug adds the following: Mithra (*Mitra*), "sun" (Rigveda III. lix.); Airyaman (*Aryaman*); Baga (*Bagha*); Armaiti (*Aramati*); Nairyo-çanha (*Nara-çansa*), "praised by men"; Vayu (*Vayu*); Verethraghna (*Vrit-raha*), "dragon-slayer"; and the thirty-three Ratus, with Yima-Khshaeta (*Yama-rājā*) or Jamshid, son of Vivanghat (*Vivāsvat*); Thrita or Thraetona (*Trita* or *Traitana*) the hero Feridun, son of Athwyo (*Aptya*, "waters"). These terms closely connect Persian and Vedic mythology, though Indra becomes a fiend in Persia. The titles for priests are the same in both systems, and such words as Haoma (*Soma*), with the use of sacred twigs or grass, of cow's urine, the sacred necklace, the holy mountain, and the seven regions of earth.

preached his reformed creed in the thirtieth year of King Vistasp—father of Darius I. and predecessor of Cyrus—or two hundred and fifty-eight years before the coming of Alexander the Great.[1] This "most white high priest" (Zarathustra Spitama) thus preached in 588 B.C.; and we can hardly regard it as an accidental circumstance that he was nearly contemporary with Buddha in India, and with Confucius in China. A great wave of ethical progress was passing over Asia in the sixth century B.C.; and the appearance of these three great reformers, and of their contemporaries Maha-vira and Laotze, may have been due to the teaching of one of the older Buddhas (such as Kasyapa) in the north of India. As to the teaching of Zoroaster, we may confine our attention to the two ancient hymns (or Gathas) in which he is made to speak in person. Nearly all the other Persian scriptures are later in language, and never claim to be the utterances of the prophet himself. The teaching of the two oldest Gathas also coincides more closely with that of the inscriptions of Darius I. than does that of any of the later priestly writings.

The Persians, like the Assyrians, Hebrews and Vedic poets, wrote hymns in regular metre. The first Gatha (or "song"), which was probably handed down orally, is in such metre; but it is a disjointed composition with additions by one or other of Zoroaster's three disciples.[2] The prophet himself addresses his race: "Ye offspring of renowned ancestors, awake and join us." "In the beginning there was a twin pair, two spirits each of his own nature: the good and the bad in thought, word, and deed. Choose one of these two spirits—the good and not the bad. These two spirits together first created, the one that which is

[1] Bundahish, xxxiv. 78.

[2] Haug, "Essays," pp. 136–61. Darmesteter dates even the oldest Gathas much later.

real, the other the unreal. The existence of liars will become bad, while he who believes in the true God will prosper." The old dualism is thus taught; but the later Persians, at least, considered (like the Hindus and Japanese) that the creating and destroying spirits were but two aspects of one God; and even in Egypt we have the two-headed god—as among Hittites and Etruscans—who (as Set-Hor) represents a pair of twin brothers, or a god who sends both evil and good. The Gatha does not distinctly proclaim any resurrection, but, as in the older religions, it teaches that the wicked perish. "Let us be such as help the life of the future: the immortal spirits maintain it. The prudent man desires only to be there where Wisdom has its home: Wisdom is the refuge from lies, and the annihilation of the destroying spirit." The singer claims to have received such wisdom from the good spirit. "When mine eyes beheld thee, O source of truth, Creator of life, manifest in thy works, then I knew thee to be the primeval spirit, O Wise One high in mind, creating the world, the father of good will."

The second Gatha is a more formal and orderly composition, beginning with a prayer for happiness and for a good will or mind. Ahura-mazdā is here called the "source of light," creating all good things by the power of his good mind. This philosophy may have influenced the Greek conception of the Logos, as already described. "I am Zarathustra," says the singer, "I will show myself a destroyer of liars and a comforter of the pious": "Standing at thy fire, among thy worshippers who pray to thee, I will remember the truth as long as I am able": "I will ask for both of us all that thou mayest be asked. For the King will—as only mighty men are allowed—make thee for thine answers a mighty fire." The speaker continues to claim that he is inspired by the good

mind revealed to him by Sraosha, the angel of prayer, and he prays for "a long life," and for the destruction of "the liar," or evil spirit. "My heart desires," he says, "that I may know thee, thou Wise One," and "how I may come to the dwelling of God and angels to hear you sing." He offers the most costly of sacrifices—the royal "horse sacrifice," as in India—and denounces "the priest and the prophet of the idols." He addresses those who have come "from far and near," teaching that the liar cannot destroy "the second life." "Health and immortality are, through the power of the good mind, in the keeping of the Wise One." "Him whom I desire to worship, and to celebrate with my hymns, mine eyes have just beheld." "Let us therefore lay our gifts of praise in the dwelling of the singers"—that is, let our prayers go up to heaven. But as yet the new faith is struggling for its life. "Whither," he continues, "shall I go? What land shelters the master and his comrade? Neither subjects nor wicked rulers reverence me": "the wicked man enjoys the fields of the angel of truth. . . . Who drives him from his dominion, O Wise One? He who goes forth in the paths of good understanding." "Those who gather round me to adore, all these I will lead over the Bridge of the Gatherer." "The sway is given into the hands of priests and prophets of idols." "O Zarathustra, who is thy true friend in the great work? Who will proclaim it in public? King Vistasp is the very man who will do so." In this poem, therefore, we find a faith which answers closely to that proclaimed on the monuments of Darius.

But the power of the Magi was not altogether destroyed by the reformer, and as time went on the faith became encrusted with ancient superstitions, and its Buddhist-like insistence on "good thought, word and deed," was converted into a priestly cultus.

Even in the three later Gathas, which are still written in the oldest dialect, we read that "Zarathustra assigned in times of yore, as a reward to the Magi, the Paradise to which the Wise One first had gone"; and they claimed that Zoroaster and his three disciples belonged to "the party of all the ancient fire-priests who were pious and spread the truth." It is remarkable, however, that in the third Gatha we read: "When wilt thou appear, O Wise One, with men of strength and courage, to pollute the intoxicating liquor—the devil's art that makes the idol priests insolent, and increases the evil spirit's power in the lands?" Thus the Haoma drink was not apparently prescribed by Zoroaster, but was the survival of old Magian rites—a sacred intoxicant (the Indian *soma*), which seems to have been probably a kind of beer, as it still is among the Iron tribes of the Caucasus, offered with sacred loaves of bread (*darun*), as among the Aryans of India. Nor was this rite peculiar to Aryans, for even in Egypt we find the sacred cup of wine offered with sacred cakes; and, among all early races, the effect of alcohol on the brain was mistaken for possession by a living spirit whose material body was this "water of life"—the Amrita or ambrosia.

Other ancient works of ritual have survived, in a dialect rather later than that of the monumental texts, and appear not to be older than about 400 B.C.[1] The first of these is the Vendidad, or "Law for fiends"—a very disjointed prose work, including ancient metrical fragments, and primitive legends. It relates the preservation of Yima, the first man, during a fearful winter in the far northern "Aryan home." Its geography includes the Bactrian regions, and the Tigris is the western boundary. It speaks of the "three races" of Media, which were no doubt those

[1] *Vendidad*, see "Sacred Books of the East," vol. iv., by Darmesteter, 1880; *Yashts*, see vol. xxiii. of the same work, 1883.

for whom Darius wrote in three languages. It preserves an ancient rite of human sacrifice as cruel as were the punishments meted out by Darius to his foes. It exhorts the tribesmen to till the earth, and denounces celibacy, quoting an ancient song. Its language is still free from foreign Semitic words, and the use of money seems still to be unknown, while contracts are as yet only verbal. It mentions ordeal by brimstoned water, and speaks of evil spirits (even in sacred fire and water) causing death. It prescribes the rites for giving the corpse to dogs and birds, and those of Haoma libations. Its laws as to doctors recall those of 'Ammurabi. The sacred dog is already noticed as the guard who takes the dead man to the bridge of heaven. Its magic rites of purification, with their circles and cup-hollows, belong to the prehistoric age; and the spells recall those of the Akkadians. It includes an ancient metrical fragment describing the temptation of Zoroaster, by the evil spirit, while yet an infant, and his conquest of the fiend by aid of the Word given to him by the Holy Spirit in the "boundless time." The later commentators suppose this book also to refer to Zoroaster's receiving the Law from God on the "mount of questions," and he is represented approaching the sacred tree (the tamarisk), as he invokes the elemental gods. We are told that the dead are led over the Bridge of the Gatherer by a maiden angel accompanied by her dogs, and a later writer explains that she is the dead man's good conscience created by his good thought, word, and deed.[1] The pious thus reach the "house of hymns" where they are "gathered together." For the evil man—as taught in other works—is blown away by an evil wind, to dwell in darkness with the fiend.

[1] See "Sacred Books of the East," xxiii.; *Vistasp Yasht*, viii. 56–64, pp. 343, 345.

The Yashts, or hymns to the gods, who became later only angels under Ahura-mazdā, appear to belong to the age of Artaxerxes II. at earliest; and we have seen that he first adds the name of Anahita ("the undefiled" goddess of living waters), and of Mithra ("the shiner"), who was the god of day, to that of Ahura-mazdā. Ahura himself is even said to have offered sacrifice to Anahita, as did all the ancient heroes whom she aided to overcome monsters, and to cross rivers dryshod. For her, too, God made four horses, "the wind, the rain, the cloud, and the sleet." Mithra is the "friend" and the god of truth. "He takes out of distress and from death the man who has not lied to him," and confounds the liars. But the "man without light" grieves him by saying in his heart, "Careless Mithra does not see all the evil done, nor all the lies that are told." Another of these nineteen hymns is devoted to Sraosha, the angel of prayer, who : "the Incarnate Word," the sleepless protector of the poor; and the longest Yasht is a litany commemorating all the Fravashis, or good genii of creation, and those of all holy men in the past, with the spirits of those who will accompany Sosiosh—the Persian Messiah—and his two forerunners, who will all three be born of virgin mothers in the future. It includes an allusion to Gautama Buddha as "the heretic." It commemorates "the holy king Vistasp, the gallant one, who was the Incarnate Word," and the holy men of Turanian countries even as far as China. These writings, therefore, present to us the Zoroastrian creed as it existed when Alexander conquered Persia.

Of the religious history during the next five centuries, while Greek influence was strong in Western Asia, we have only a few fragmentary indications from the monuments of Commagene and of Asia Minor. Antiochus of Commagene[1] identifies Ahura-mazdā

[1] See Chap. III. p. 109.

with Zeus, Mithra with Apollo, and Verethragna, "the victorious," with Herakles. He expects as a reward for piety that, after a long life, his "god-beloved soul will be sent to the heavenly throne of Zeus-Oromazdes, to rest for endless ages." He speaks of the "sacred law," and of "royal spirits," and he endowed priests wearing the Persian vestments who were to sacrifice at his shrine on "the top of the passes of the Taurus." He invokes all the "paternal gods—Persian and Macedonian—of the land of Commagene, and every household god." Thus the mixed Greco-Parthian creed was founded apparently on that of the Persian kings who preceded Alexander. This creed spread to the shores of Ionia; and in Phrygia we find a text of "Mithradates, high priest of Asia," while a little farther north we have a bas-relief of Mithra accompanied by his dog,[1] belonging to about the first century A.D. In the second century Pausanias[2] found Magi in Lydia singing hymns out of a book. In Cappadocia there was a strong Persian element, and the calendar was that of the later Persian age,[3] which was quite different from the calendar of Darius I. In 60 B.C. the Roman soldiers of Pompey's army brought to Rome the worship of Mithra, which became fashionable all over the empire in our second century. It included the offering of the sacred cakes and sacred Haoma drink, together with secret rites, in the cave chapels, which apparently formed no part of the original faith of Zoroaster. Mithra with his dog is commonly represented, in Roman sculpture, slaying the "earth bull," according to the very ancient legend of the primeval beast cut up for the benefit of men, which appears to be an agricultural myth, connected with the inculcation of

[1] Hamilton, "Asia Minor," 1842, i: text No. 160, ii. p. 140.
[2] V. xxvii. 3.
[3] As in "Bundahish," xxv. 20.

agricultural duty even in the first Gatha.[1] Ritual and mysticism thus spread over Western Europe from Persia, but we have nothing to show us that this was accompanied by the teaching of "good thought, word, and deed."

The establishment of the faith by the first Sassanian kings, after 226 A.D., produced a large literature founded on the Avesta, but written in Pehlevi—a later Persian dialect full of words borrowed from the Aramaic language of the Semitic race. This includes the Bundahish, or "original creation," which attempts to sum up the science and philosophy of the age; with the Bahman Yasht—an apocalyptic work—and the treatise on the "Proper and Improper," which is to the Persian faith what the Mishnah is to the Jewish. These works, as we now have them,[2] belong to the period immediately preceding the Arab conquest, but they contain much that was evidently borrowed by the earlier Persians from the crude science and mythology of Babylonia. The Bundahish treats of the six days of creation, and of the fall of man through disobedience. It contains a legend of the child abandoned on the river, and it adheres to old Babylonian ideas as to geography and astronomy. It also treats of the resurrection, when those in whom the fire of immortality exists will rise from their tombs to heaven, the wicked also rising, to be judged and cast into hell. Sosiosh (the Messiah) will feast the pious on the primeval ox (as in the Talmud), and they will live for ever, but beget no more children. The same Messianic expectation of a millennium following a time of trouble is also the subject of the Pehlevi Bahman Yasht. These doctrines, however, as we have seen, probably existed in a less developed form even as early as 400 B.C.; and the Jews, during their subjection

[1] Haug, "Essays," p. 140.

[2] "Sacred Books of the East," v. 1880, by West.

to Persia, thus appear to have become acquainted with the Persian doctrines of resurrection, and of a future reincarnate prophet or king. The Moslems also adapted these Persian ideas in their later legends about the end of the world.

vii. India.—Our first contemporary information about Indian religion (as distinguished from late copies of sacred books) is derived from the monumental decrees of Asoka, in the third century B.C. In his time there was already a marked distinction between the superstitions of the ignorant masses, the creed of kings and Brahmans, and the philosophy of the higher thinkers. We trace this distinction earlier perhaps in Persia, and back to a remote age in Egypt, but in India it is specially marked throughout actual history. The first inhabitants of whom we know anything were Dravidians, of Turanian race; and their savage superstitions are still preserved, though the names given to the village godlings are now more often of Aryan than of Turanian origin. Even the terrible rites of human sacrifice are hardly extinct among the Khonds, and all the Akkadian sorcery survives in the peasant faith.[1] The three great gods of the Hindu system—Brahma, Siva, and Vishnu — bear Aryan names, but in character they answer exactly to An, Enlil, and Ea, among the Akkadians—deities of heaven, hell, and ocean. The savage consort of Siva in his aspect of destroyer, bears the names Durga and Kali, which answer to those of the Akkadian hell goddess, signifying "fate" and "death." The religion of the Puranas, or "traditions" (some of which are believed to have existed as early as our second century), is quite distinct from that of the Vedic bards, though the

[1] See Forlong, "Faiths of Man," 1906, *s.v.* Khonds, Sacrifice, etc.; and Crooke, "Popular Religion and Folk Lore of North India," 1894.

Hindu gods are noticed in the later Vedas, after the Aryans had settled in Northern India. It seems to be founded, not on any Aryan basis, but on the older Turanian beliefs, and it is specially notable for its phallic symbolism, which was detestable in the eyes of the Vedic poets. The Purana pantheon, with its mythology, offers otherwise no features that distinguish it from the older gross superstitions of Western Asia, as to which enough has already been said.

The Rig-Veda, or "Praise-knowledge,"[1] contains the rude hymns of the free nomads of Bactria—the Aryans who gradually migrated into the Panjāb, where apparently they found a settled and civilised Turanian population. Their numbers must have increased at the time when Darius I. added an Indian province to his empire; and their mythology, as we have seen, was intimately connected with that of the Magi. Such hymns may be of great antiquity, and the Vedic language is archaic, but the Rig-Veda contains no allusions to writing, and it is generally admitted that the songs cannot have been reduced to writing before about 500 B.C., when the Aramean alphabet was introduced into North India by the Persians. The Brahmanas, which comment on the Vedas after they have become sacred and are regarded as inspired, are yet later, and the philosophy of the Upanishads, or "sessions," is perhaps not as old as the time of Alexander's attack on the Panjāb. Max Müller devoted his life to the study of the Vedas, but he confesses that they contain "a great deal of what is childish and foolish. . . .Many hymns are utterly unmeaning and insipid." They represent the praises of elemental gods, such as Varuna, "heaven," Diaush, "day," Indra, "the rainer," Aditi, the "boundless," and the Maruts or "storms." Only here and there do we

[1] See Max Müller, "Lecture on the Vedas," in *Selected Essays*, 1881, ii. pp. 109–59.

find even the germs of higher thought, as when we read,[1] "They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni, or he is the well-winged heavenly Garutmat: that which is One the wise call in divers manners." The hymns often recall those of the Akkadians, and the singer excuses his sins[2] in the manner which we have already studied, as being unintended errors. "Let me not yet, O Varuna, enter into the house of earth: have mercy, almighty, have mercy!" "Whenever we mortals, O Varuna, commit an offence before the heavenly host, whenever we break the law through thoughtlessness, punish us not, O God, for that offence." "Absolve us from the sins of our fathers and from those committed in our own bodies."

The Vedic poets believed that the pious would live for ever in heaven, and say nothing about transmigration of the soul. They say that "he who gives alms goes to the highest place in heaven," "the kind man is greater than the great in heaven." They pray for "a strong son . . . through whom we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode," preserving the old belief in the necessity of feeding the ghost. They invoke Soma (god of the "immortal" drink) to take them to the third heaven, and speak of the hell dogs of Yama (god of the underworld), and of the "pit" into which the lawless are cast by Indra if they offer no sacrifice: "Those who break the commandments of Varuna, and who speak lies, are born for that deep place." They, however, advance to the idea of an "unborn Being" who "established the six worlds,"[3] the germ that produced all from chaos "by the power of heat"[4]; but they add, "who

[1] Rig-Veda, i. 164, 46.

[2] Hymn to Varuna, Rig-Veda, vii. 89.

[3] "Rig-Veda," i. 164, 6. See Max Müller, "Hibbert Lectures," 1878, p. 315.

[4] "Rig-Veda," x. 129, 2.

knows the secret? . . . the most high seer that is in the highest heaven knows it, or perchance even he knows not." It is not till we reach the later age of philosophic discussion[1]—perhaps due to the influence of Plato and of the Bactrian Greeks—that we find the nature of the soul studied; and, after it has been shown not to be the reflection in the eye or in water, nor a dream-spirit, it is defined at last as the "self that is immortal and without body," like the wind—"the serene soul rising out of the body," to appear in its "own form," retaining its consciousness, and still regarded as corporeal though of airy nature. It springs up again like corn from the seed: "it is not born, it dies not." "The Self is smaller than small; greater than great; hidden in the heart of the creature." It is but part of the Universal Soul —a spark of the divine fire—for "there is one eternal thinker thinking non-eternal thoughts." "When all desires that dwell in the heart cease, then the mortal becomes immortal and obtains Brahma." Immortality is thus finally regarded as the loss of individuality, and as union with God, just as in Egypt. The Buddhist philosophy is indistinguishable from that of the Brahmans, and even in the great epic of the Mahābharata the law of love is taught, while in the Hindu laws as early perhaps as 200 B.C. we find the ethical command, "Let no man do to others what is painful to himself."

The Hindu philosophy of the third century B.C. is elaborated in well-known episodes inserted in the old epic which is devoted to the mythical wars of Kurus and Pandus. These episodes include the Bhagavad-gita (or "divine lay"), and the Anu-gita or "spirit song."[2] In the first of these we find the four Hindu castes fully established, and the philosopher says that "the wise man should not shake the

[1] "Hibbert Lectures," 1878, pp. 318–27, 333-5, 354.

[2] "Sacred Books of the East," viii., by K. T. Telang.

convictions of the ignorant." He desires the welfare of all beings, and offers only spiritual sacrifice. He teaches two ways, the one being that of knowledge or philosophy, and the other that of Yoga or mystic trance. He believes the soul to be pre-existent from eternity, and eternal. He converts the popular incarnation of Vishnu, known as Krishna, into a pantheistic deity in whom all exist. Krishna says in his long talk with the hero Arjuna: "I am life: I am love": "I am not in them, but they are in me": "I am the sacrifice": "I am the beginning, the middle, and the end": "I am the letter A": "To me none is hateful, none dear": "I am death": "I will release you from all sins. Be not grieved." In the Anugita this mysticism is further developed, and while the eternal results of conduct (Karma) are proclaimed, the doctrine of transmigration is taught. The "unity in variety" here noticed recalls the doctrine of Plato, but the Hindu belief in ecstasy transcending the senses is added, and reminds us of the later Greek mystic Plotinus. The phenomena of nature are not only transient, but are regarded as not really existent—"inconstant, and their name is delusion." Thus the ascetic, self-hypnotised, becomes deluded by the belief that the unreal is real, and the real unreal, finally becoming incapable of distinguishing the two, and approaching the border-line of madness.

The Vishnu-Sutra,[1] as edited in our third or fourth century, is a code of strictly Brahman law, representing the final decay of Indian religion, and full of caste prejudices and superstitious rites, like those of the Talmud, or of the Laws of Manu in the second century B.C. Vishnu is here supposed to speak, and is described—the Soma drink being his blood. The doctrine of transmigration is fully taught, and the

[1] "Sacred Books of the East," vii.: "The Institutes of Vishnu," 1880, by Jolly.

heavens and hells are not regarded as eternal abodes for any soul. The retreat of the ascetic to a forest is customary, and the method of inducing a condition of hypnotic ecstasy is minutely described. "Those who are born must die, and those who die must live again. This is inevitable, and no comrade can follow a man" (in death). "Virtue alone will follow him wherever he may go, therefore do your duty unflinchingly in this wretched world." Such is the final conclusion reached by the Hindu mind in the long course of advance from Vedic times.

When we turn back from such pessimism to the inscriptions of Asoka we emerge into the light of day. He is traditionally supposed to have been converted to Buddhism in 250 B.C.; and he erected an inscribed pillar on the exact spot where Gautama Buddha was supposed to have been born: he describes himself also, in 242 B.C., as devoted to "the former Buddhas." But, out of thirty edicts[1] which are found repeated in various parts of his empire, only one—addressed to the monks—can be regarded as really Buddhist; this dates about 232 B.C., and includes seven passages from Buddhist scriptures for edification of monks, nuns, and the male and female laity. About 256 B.C. (the sixteenth year of his reign) Asoka was sending out missionaries to the contemporary Greek kings of the West, and some fourteen years later his humane views led him to forbid, not only bloody sacrifices, but even the use of animal food. But as a whole his proclamations attest only that wide toleration for religious differences, and that high ethical code, which were common also to the Persians.

[1] See Vincent Smith, "Early History of India," 1904, p. 146. These include the seven Rock Edicts (257 B.C.); the two Kalinga Edicts (256); three Cave Texts (257–250); two Tarai Pillars (249); six Pillars with seven Edicts (243); two Delhi Pillars (240); seven Minor Rock Edicts (252 B.C.); and the Bhābrā Boulder of about the same date.

One edict[1] is thus rendered: "Thus says his Majesty. Father and mother must be obeyed, respect for living creatures must likewise be enforced, truth must be spoken; these are the virtues of the Law of Duty (Dharma) which must be practised. Likewise the teacher must be reverenced by the pupil, and a proper courtesy must be shown to relations. This is the ancient standard of duty: this leads to length of days; and according to this men must act." Again, he says: "There is no such charity as the charitable gift of the Law of Duty: no such distribution as the distribution of duty." "Of the two means, pious regulations are of small account, whereas meditation is of greater value."[2]

Asoka's advice to the various sects is a model that might well be set before all Churches to-day. He "desires that all the sects should dwell in all places. They all indeed seek after subjugation and purity of heart. . . . Let every one, whether he receives abundant alms or not, have self-control, purity of heart, thankfulness, and firmness of love. That is always excellent." "King Piyadasi, beloved of the gods, honours all sects, both recluses and laymen. . . . But this is the foundation of all—moderation in speech: that there should be no praising of one's own sect and decrying of other sects; that there should be no depreciation without cause, but rather a rendering of honour to other sects for whatever cause honour is due. . . . Whoever exalts his own sect, by decrying others, doubtless does so out of love for his own sect, thinking to spread the fame thereof. But on the contrary he inflicts the more an injury on his own sect. Therefore is concord best, in that all should hear, and love to hear, the Duties of each other: . . . the beloved of the gods attaches less weight to alms, and to honours, than to the desire

[1] Minor Rock Edict II. [2] Rock Edict XI.; Pillar Edict VII.

that the good name, and moral virtues, which are the essential part of the teaching of all sects may increase. To this end ministers of religion everywhere strive, and the officers placed over women, and the inspectors, and other officials. And this is the fruit thereof, namely the prosperity of one's own sect, and the exaltation of religion generally."[1]

Of Gautama the Buddha, whose influence is traceable in Asoka's ethical teaching, we really know but little. He was the son of the Raja of Kapila-vastu, north of Patna. The date of his death is disputed within several centuries, but appears according to Asoka's calculation[2] to have occurred about 488 or 487 B.C., when he was eighty years old (according to the account of his death in Buddhist scripture): so that he was born twenty years after the time when Zoroaster began to preach. Unlike his predecessors, "the former Buddhas," he was of Brahman caste, educated in the knowledge of Vedic religion and philosophy. Like all good Hindus, he retreated to the forest for meditation, but his genius enabled him to perceive the unreality of the usual aspirations and beliefs, and to reject the pretensions of his own caste. It was not through pessimistic philosophy, mysticism, or pious observances, that Gautama became a master of men. In the eyes of disciples who had long admired his ascetic practices he cast aside the means of salvation for himself; he rose from his tree and went forth again—despised and rejected as a backslider—to the world of men. It was by love that he conquered in the end, and love still makes his name beloved by three hundred millions who yet do not understand him. His long life enabled him to win again the veneration of all, and the acceptance of the new

[1] See "Hibbert Lectures," 1881, "Indian Buddhism," Rhys Davids, p. 230.

[2] "Minor Rock Edicts."

"Path" that he preached. For, to the teaching of moral duty and justice which Aristotle combined with a broad toleration, he added the nobler teaching of the law of love. He taught that "hate is never overcome by hate, but only by love": that men should not only subdue all their evil passions, but should "strive to the end" for the good of others. He created an order charged to preach this law to all mankind. He laid down no dogmas for his Church, but bade each man to be "a light to himself." He taught no secret doctrines to the wise, but openly addressed all men, however simple. And herein, like all the greatest teachers of mankind, he is distinguished from lesser men by breadth of sympathy and true understanding.

The followers of Gautama the Buddha (or "enlightened one") were to strive to be "full of confidence, modest in heart, ashamed of wrong, strong in energy, active in mind, and full of learning": "living in the practice, both in public and in private, of those virtues which, when unbroken, intact, unspotted, and unblemished, make men free, and which are untarnished by belief in the efficacy of any outward acts of ritual or ceremony, by any hopes as to some kind of future life." He taught the law of Duty, and he proclaimed that the results of conduct (Karma) were inevitable and eternal: that goodness would bring the peace and rest which men then sought by the "going out" (Nirvana), from among their fellows, to a deceptive tranquillity in solitude.

The voluminous literature of Buddha's disciples was arranged (probably in the time of Asoka) in the great Canon of Scripture which was divided into three Pitakas or "baskets," including works of various age between 350 and 200 B.C.[1] These Scriptures include

[1] See Max Müller in "Selected Essays," 1881, ii. p. 177. These three Pitakas are: the "Vinaya," five books on sins, etc.; the "Sutta," five works on law, praise, legends, and parables; the "Abhi-

much that is valueless—obsolete philosophy, and useless asceticism, such as Gautama himself probably never taught—but the underlying idea is described as "Love far-reaching, grown great, and beyond measure." The later Buddhist dogma of transmigration—a reversion to superstition—is not found in the Pitakas at all.[1] Nor do they teach apathy or pessimism, but only the subjection of evil desires, and a ceaseless striving for the good of all. The legend of Buddha, which relates his miraculous birth, his temptation by the fiend under the tree, his transfiguration, and final ascension to heaven, is only traceable some six hundred years after his death.[2] Buddha had probably no belief in such marvels; but the history of his Order is one of gradual decay, and reversion to prejudice and superstition, till finally the teaching of duty and love was superseded by that of blind faith, and men were bidden to repeat incessantly the sacred name Amitabha, whereby—and not by their deeds—they would be saved. The good master became a God of Mercy, one "looking down"[3] on man, and hearing prayer. In the time of Kanishka—the Mongol ruler of North-West India—or some six centuries after Gautama's death, the newer school, called that of the "higher means," superseded the older Buddhism of the "lower means," which gradually was confined to Ceylon, and spread thence to Burma and Siam. The new school of "High Church" Buddhism developed both ritual and mysticism. It became a religion of idle monks, of forms and ceremonies, of vestments, litanies, idols, and rosaries, bells and

dhamma," seven works on more advanced philosophy. The second Pitaka includes the "Book of the Great Departure," relating Buddha's last sayings and death.

[1] Rhys Davids, "Hibbert Lectures," 1881, p. 91.

[2] See Beal, "Romantic History of Buddha," 1875, p. viii.

[3] *Avalo-kit Isvara*, the "down-looking being."

praying-wheels, of blind faith in deities derived from Indian polytheism, and not from any teaching of Buddha. Nirvana was now understood to be, not a going forth to solitude, but a leaving of this world (just as we speak of the "departed") for some peaceful future which none could define; and, since many meanings were given to the word because ideas of the future differed greatly among various sects, the term Nirvana continues to be a subject of controversy among scholars in Europe also.[1] When we come down to the seventh century we find the biography of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsiang (who visited India in 630 A.D., and travelled fourteen years in all in order to bring back to China true copies of the original Buddhist scriptures) to be full of superstitions similar to those of the contemporary Byzantine Christians.[2] We read of miraculous images and lights, sacred trees and foot-prints, legends, and naked ascetics, and of Buddha's tooth, which was an inch and a half long, ever emitting a sparkling light. Buddhism finally disappeared in India after about 800 A.D., being absorbed by the Brahmans, who made Buddha the ninth incarnation of Vishnu. The substitution of a flower, or a fruit, for the old bloody sacrifices in the temples was the only gain when the caste tyranny was once more fully established.

In the West, Buddhism appeared on the Syrian coasts as early at least as 250 B.C.[3] It influenced the Stoics in Greece, the Essenes (or "recluses") in Palestine, and the Therapeutai (or "ministrants") in

[1] See "Hibbert Lectures," 1881, pp. 161, 254.

[2] "Life of Hiuen-Tsiang," Beal, 1888, pp. 11, 66, 67, 103, 120, 161, 181.

[3] Calanus, who burnt himself in presence of Alexander, according to Strabo and Plutarch, was an Indian ascetic who may have been a Buddhist, as his ideas of caste did not prevent his travelling. The same authorities also notice Sraman-acharya, who burnt himself in Athens about 23 A.D. See Plutarch, "Alexander," iii.

Egypt. It was an element in Gnosticism in our second and third centuries. The legend of Buddha's virgin birth was known to Jerome, and the yellow-robed ascetic to Chrysostom. In the East, Ceylon was converted during Asoka's reign, and thence the "lesser means" were preached in Burma and Siam. China is said to have accepted the "greater means" as early as 65 A.D., and this corrupt sacerdotalism reached Japan from Korea in 552 A.D., and penetrated among the devil-worshippers of Tibet a century later. Turanian Buddhism was little better than the old sorceries, and, save among a few true disciples, the fogs of superstition have entirely obscured the light of truth and love, which burns dimly among them.

viii. China and Japan.—The religion of the Far East may be more briefly treated, since it shows no new features, and is for the most part derived from older sources in West Asia. The literature concerned is very voluminous, but not very ancient; while the great book-burning edict of the Tsin dynasty, issued in 221, was only repealed by the Hans in 191 B.C., which makes it very doubtful whether we can suppose any ancient writings to have survived, though some are said to have been hidden; for scholars who did not obey the edict were buried alive, according to Chinese accounts. The "Five Classics" which Confucius admired do not appear to be older than about 650 B.C., and the Yi-King, or "book of changes," which is the first of them, is a magical work very difficult to understand. The second book (Shu-King) contains legendary history; the third (Shih-King) poetry; the fourth (Li-ki-King) rites and ethics; while the fifth (Kun-khin-King), or "spring and autumn," is ascribed to Confucius himself early in the fifth century B.C. These works, now translated by Dr. Legge, are of a very primitive and almost childish nature; and we have

unfortunately no early inscriptions on which to form a really sound estimate of early Chinese beliefs.

The modern religion of China, however, compares with the very oldest Akkadian superstitions, with an admixture of later philosophy and mysticism, introduced from India after the beginning of the sixth century B.C. The Jin-Tao, or "way of spirits," is but the old animism of prehistoric ages, with all the usual beliefs in immortal spirits, ghosts, and demons; while the ancestor worship of the Chinese has become a tyranny of the dead greater than that of the Pitris or "paternal" spirits in India, or of the Penates in Italy. The Emperor of China is the "son of heaven," like the Akkadian En-anna-du or "heaven-born prince." He is supreme not only over man but over gods, spirits, and manes also. The imperial gods are the two spirits of heaven and earth so often invoked in Akkadian litanies. The three kings of heaven, ocean, and hell, correspond exactly to those already described in Chaldea; and all customs of divination, augury, lots, and spells, are of equal antiquity. The Chinese believe, like the Egyptians, that each human being has three souls. Their myth of Pan-ku,[1] from whose body all things were produced, recalls not only the story of Brahma's egg in India, or that of Gayo-mard, the "bull-man" in Persia, but yet older legends of Babylonia and Phœnicia, according to which man and other creatures were produced from the blood of a god, who sacrificed himself to himself, like Odin among the Norse. The Kuen-lun Paradise,[2] in the West, with its jewelled peach-tree, is the same that we find described in the myth of Gilgamas. The mythical five emperors, each born of a virgin, recall the incarnations of Vishnu, and even the Manchu dynasty traces to a tree-born ancestor whose legend is the same as that of

[1] See Williams, "Middle Kingdom," ii. p. 139.

[2] "Chinese Recorder," vii. pp. 357, 369.

Adonis. Chinese philosophy, like that of the Indian "Dualists," teaches that all things originate in Yan and Yin—the "male" and "female" elements in nature, thus going back to the ancient phallic symbolism which is so common in India, and which among the Greeks was connected with the worship of Dionusos (the god of heat and fruit), and with the secret mysteries of Eleusis.

This primeval faith was, however, modified by the introduction of Indian mysticism, when Lao-tze (605–515 B.C.) began to teach a mystic philosophy concerning the Tao or "way"—the cause of all (though not the original Unborn Spirit), and the "great mother" or female emanation, like the Wisdom of the Bible. Union with the Tao was to be the object of the sage in ecstasy, and we may well suppose that this teacher derived his ideas from some Indian mystic, whether one of the "former Buddhas," or perhaps Mahā-vira, the great Jain ascetic, who was contemporary (598–528 B.C.) with Lao-tze, in India. But mysticism was not congenial to the Chinese character, and though this teacher—or his disciples—condemned Confucius for his hard practical teaching of "propriety," and for his silence as to beliefs about the future, yet the ethics of the "Learned Kung" have been far more influential in China than the "third religion" of the Tao. Confucius was the younger man (551–478 B.C.), and is said to have listened in modest silence to the rhapsodies of Lao-tze. His own teaching was purely ethical, and was summed up in the Golden Rule, "What you do not wish others to do to you, do not to them." He also may perhaps have learned something from India, but his moral teaching is the same which we find in earlier times all over Asia. "Study," he said, "self-control, modesty, forbearance, patience, kindness, order, inoffensiveness: subdue passion; be studious, mild, dutiful, neighbourly, faithful, upright,

moderate, polite, well-mannered; and cultivate intelligence and alertness, but avoid extremes." Such is the teaching which has moulded the ideas and customs of China and Japan for over twenty-five centuries. Regarding rites and beliefs, Confucius, like the later Asoka, considered them of secondary importance; and he was loth to offend the superstitious masses of his fellow-countrymen, to rob them of their hopes of future life, or to break down the ancient customs of filial piety. Mencius ("teacher Mang"), the great disciple of Confucius (371–288 B.C.), was a statesman who looked forward to the time when wars should cease; for "the human heart possesses in itself the germs of perfect virtue and wisdom." He taught that the king whose power was given by heaven should resemble heaven in justice and goodness. He was violently opposed by pessimists and mystics, but only retorted, "Let their stories spread if only they teach sound principles." "He who delights in heaven will influence a whole empire by his love and protection." The Buddhism which was recognised as the "second religion" in China was a corrupt monkish formalism, preserving little of the spirit of Gautama; but the teaching of Confucius was the guiding star not only of Chinese rulers, from the Hans downwards, but also of the great tolerant Khans, whose sway, in the thirteenth century, extended over nearly the whole of Asia.

The original faith of the Japanese race, who came from Korea in 660 B.C., with Jimmu-Tennu, fifth in descent from Amaterasu-no-kami, the sun goddess, is now known as Shin-to, from the Chinese Jin-tao, or "spirit way," translated in Japanese as Kami-no-michi, "the way of the gods." It is an animism of the same kind before described, though some of its symbols—such as the sacred mirror, and the sacred sword—are peculiar. The demon figures which flank the sacred

gateways of Japan are the same fearful guardians who, as we have seen, defended houses and temples among the Hittites and Akkadians in the West, and who are supposed to be controlled by Shamans in Tibet and Mongolia, being made subject by spells to the wizard priest, and compelled to frighten lesser fiends away. The first inhabitants of Japan were cannibals, and the rites of human sacrifice at tombs were not finally abolished till 646 A.D. But after 552 A.D. the manners of the Japanese were softened by the influence of Confucian ethics, and of Buddhism, which—though in a very corrupt form—was introduced in that year from China. Shin-to is now a mild belief in countless spirits and ghosts, propitiated by simple offerings and short invocations. The family shrine contains the Penates of the tribe, the ancestral tablets, and the "spirit sticks," which are reverenced each day at sunrise. But the peasant believes that he is better prayed for by the divine Mikado, who has been born a descendant of the sun goddess as a reward for all his merits in former lives on earth.[1]

Japanese sacred literature dates only from the eighth century A.D.,[2] and contains many graceful and some terrible legends of the gods. The story of the babe abandoned in his cradle on the waters meets us again, and the myth of Persephone, or Eurydice, is recalled by that of Izanagi and his lost wife Isanami in Hades. The philosophy of the Yan-yin was also introduced from China, and the Japanese teach that God has three spirits or aspects—gentle, stern, and munificent —while man has two only—the gentle and the rough. In this we may see the three aspects of the Indian Siva as creator, preserver, and destroyer. In Japan

[1] Lafcadio Hearn, "Japan," 1905, pp. 45, 46, 50, 124, 140, 144, 159, 167, 204.

[2] The Ko-ji-ki, or "Records of Ancient Matters," 712 A.D., and the Nihongi, or "Chronicles of Japan," 720 A.D.

also we find the temple women regarded as brides of God, just as in China, in India, or in Chaldea. We find ascetics and diviners as elsewhere; and the mingling of Buddhist and Shinto beliefs produced the Ryobu-Shinto, or "twofold religion," about 800 A.D. The Japanese, however, have always shown great suspicion of priestcraft; and when Buddhist abbots began to assume temporal power, in the sixteenth century, they were massacred by the able usurper Oda Nobunaga. In the next century also, when the Jesuits attempted to secure a position in Japan like that which they then held in France, they were exiled by Hidéyoshi. They had been admitted with Xavier in 1549 A.D., under the impression that they were Buddhists; and the worship of Mary might well be mistaken for that of the Chinese "Mother of Mercy"—the goddess Kwan-yin. The only results of Jesuit efforts were the expulsion of all Christians in 1606 (when the less politic Spanish Franciscans began to denounce Shin-to beliefs), and the subsequent revolts and massacres of 1636 A.D., when Japan was closed to foreigners for more than two centuries.

At the present day, when Japan is conspicuous for its toleration (Buddhism having been disendowed and disestablished in 1867), we find strange elements conflicting with each other in her midst. The fanatical Shin-shus, preaching blind faith in a Buddha, are to be seen side by side with Salvationists preaching salvation through the blood of Christ. The peasant worshipper of ghosts is ruled by the educated statesman who has read the works of Darwin and Herbert Spencer, of Mill and Huxley. Whether all that is delightful in the ancient art and chivalry of feudal Japan is destined to be destroyed, by the greed and vulgarity of Western civilisation; whether the loyalty to a divine emperor will in time be replaced by democratic independence, rough manners, and the

insistence on rights, where now we find courtesy, cheerful fortitude, and gentle love; or whether Japan is destined to lead Asia on the old paths, to a faith that will satisfy heart and head not only in the East, but over all the world: these are the questions which the future will solve. The Japanese nature is receptive, and their intellect is acute; but some of their own leaders have expressed a doubt whether it is original; and the faith of the world in the future may perhaps first come to Japan from the West.

ix. America.—The natives of America generally are connected, as we have seen, by language and type with the Turanians of North-east Asia. Nor are they less clearly connected by religious customs and beliefs.[1] The pantheon is much the same as in ancient Asia, including the "old man above" or "soul of the sky" with the sun, moon, wind, and the god of death and hell. The tribal sacred beasts resemble not only those of Australia and Africa, but also those of Siberia, where (as among the Ainus of Japan) the bear is propitiated. Thunder was said in America to be due to the flapping wings of the heavenly eagle, whom we find in the West holding the bolts of Jove; and the Caribs suppose the lightning to be shot from a celestial blow-tube—indicating the use of this Malay weapon—while otherwise it is a "crooked serpent," as in Hebrew poetry. The owl is the sacred bird of death, after whom the heaven-bridge is named, and owl superstitions are common in Asia generally. The dog also is sacred in Peru, and this reminds us not only of Persian ideas but of the sacred dogs in Central Asia and Tibet who devour the dead. The god of light (Michabo) is a hare, which was the sign of the rising sun in Egypt, and remains the emblem of the moon in China and

[1] See Brinton, "Myths of the New World," 1876.

Japan. The *Couvade* custom (already described)[1] is found in Brazil as well as in China. The phallic symbolism of India is also known in North America and in Yucatan, and the licentious orgies of the Iroquois recall those of Polynesia and Australia, of Africa and Asia. The virgin mother of god is also common to the Indians of Peru and Paraguay, and to the Mongols, Chinese, and Hindus. The bright and dark brothers (the Greek Dioscuroi) who represent day and night were born of a virgin according to the Hurons. The Iroquois speak of the tortoise who supports the world just like the Hindus and Chinese. The Quiche account of creation from chaos is like that of the Akkadians. The Algonquins say that man has two souls, and the Dakota tribes say he has four, as the Chinese say he has three. All Americans believe in the soul's journey to another world, and some speak of the bridge leading to heaven, and others of the Milky Way as the path of souls. The custom of removing the corpse by a special door, found among the Algonquins, is ancient in China and Tibet, and was once well known in Europe also. The dog slain at the tomb becomes the guide of the soul, as in Persia. The belief in transmigration is also found in America, as is that of a second life on earth. The bones of the dead are preserved in order to secure the seed of a future body, as in Asia.

Such parallels cannot be accidental, and the character of the American wizard priests answers exactly to that of Mongol Shamans. They expel demons, and make small images of such, which they destroy like the Akkadians. They walk on fire, and gash themselves with knives: they hold séances, and hypnotise themselves, like the Asiatic magicians; and when seized with frenzy they slay all whom

[1] Chap. II. p. 52.

they meet like Malays. They see visions, fall into epileptic trances, change themselves into beasts and birds like other wizards, and fly to heaven like Indian Yogis or Jewish Rabbis. They are believed to control all the phenomena of nature, and to be able to raise the dead. They also cast horoscopes like the Babylonians, and observe all kinds of omens. They form a sacred caste as in India, while in Central America men used to slay themselves in order to accompany a dead chief, just as they did in mediæval Japan. They sacrificed their children at the bidding of their wizards, like all Asiatics, and the Peruvian widow slew herself to accompany her lord, just as in India, Scythia, or Thrace. The first Americans, crossing over from Siberia, thus appear to have brought with them all the superstitions which we find common among Turanians from the earliest known age.

But America has no history as a whole, because these emigrants brought with them nothing but the rudest system of picture-writing. When the Spaniards arrived in the sixteenth century they found established, it is true, two distinct yet cognate civilisations of considerable antiquity; but these were confined to Mexico and Peru, and in each case there are clear indications that these civilisations were directly imported from Eastern Asia in comparatively late historic times.[1] In Mexico it is reported that actual remains of Chinese temples, with inscriptions perhaps as old as 300 A.D., were found in 1897 in the Magdalen district of Sonora; and a Japanese manuscript describes the discovery of Fusang about 500 A.D. (by the Buddhist traveller Hwai-Shin, who set out from

[1] See Réville, "Hibbert Lectures," 1884; Vining, "An Inglorious Columbus," 1885; Charnay, "Ancient Cities of the New World," 1887, with Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico" and "Conquest of Peru"; Humboldt's "Vues des Corderillas," and the works of Brinton, Kingsborough, Nadaillac, Schoolcraft, Stephens, and Bancroft.

Bactria and China) in such a manner as to leave no reasonable doubt that he reached Mexico from the Aleutian Islands. Spanish accounts of Aztec customs and beliefs in Mexico fully confirm this notice of the first discovery of America of which we know anything. The Aztecs used quilted cotton armour, like the mediæval Mongols. Their folded books, printed with movable blocks, and the vertical arrangement of their hieroglyphics in certain texts, seem clearly of Chinese origin. They knew the Tartar cycle of fifty-two years. They used lacquer and stucco, and they had posting houses along their roads. Humboldt points also to the Mexican dragon standard, to their Japanese-like heraldry, marriage customs, and punishment by the wooden "kangue" collar, as connecting the Aztecs with the Chinese. In language and type there is indeed no immediate connection, though the Otomi "wanderers" in Central America speak an ancient tongue which appears to have Chinese affinities, while there is a considerable Malay admixture—perhaps recent—on the west coasts of the New World. But the similarities of custom, and especially of religion, seem such as to compel us to suppose that foreign civilisation was brought to the savage Aztecs by Chinese Buddhists a thousand years before the coming of Columbus.

The religion thus introduced could not have been the purer Buddhism of Ceylon, but resembled the degraded superstition of Tibet and China. It included the asceticism of monks and nuns living in monasteries, with penances, ablutions, the begging of alms, pilgrimages, and sacred relics. The Mexican temples resemble those of Burma and China. At Cholula the Indian elephant is carved, and a god seated on a "lion throne" closely resembles Asiatic figures of Buddha. Baptism was an Aztec rite of "second birth." The shaven crown, and the use of masks, are also Buddhist.

Hospitals were established, as in India. Auricular confession was inculcated. The highest teaching bade men to "clothe the naked and to feed the hungry," to "cherish the sick, for they are the image of God." The neophyte was vowed to chastity and poverty, and might not drink strong drink. The superior wore the same coarse dress worn by the humblest monk. The nuns were called "maids of penance," and ministered in the temples. But this asceticism was accompanied by savage superstitions. The Mexicans had a rite of "eating God"—a communion in which a dough image of the deity was torn in pieces by the worshippers, just as it still is by so-called Buddhists in Tibet. They buried a green gem in the grave as the Chinese bury a piece of jade, and placed paper charms on the corpse. They believed in heaven and hell, and in the journey of the soul. They sacrificed slaves at the tomb, as in Japan. They taught the Indian belief that material phenomena are but illusory shadows.[1] They spoke of a Deluge, and of successive destructions of the world by water, wind, earthquake, and fire—recalling the Indian Kalpas or "ages." They spoke of a virgin mother, and of a hero who is to return in the future. They used incense, and the Cross was their emblem for the "tree of life." They believed their emperor to be the child of the sun. They had a terrible ordeal,[2] as described by Sahagun and as shown on an extant Aztec bas-relief, in which the ascetic drew a barbed cord through his tongue in honour of a god armed with a "spirit-stick." To these Asiatic superstitions they added the primeval cruelties of human sacrifice, such as the Khonds in India practised till quite recent times, with

[1] According to J. F. Hewitt ("Primitive Traditional History," chap. viii.) the Aztec year of eighteen months, each of twenty days, also comes from India, and is noticed in the Mahā-Bharata.

[2] Charnay, "Ancient Cities of the New World," 1887, p. 450.

rites of new fire, and a feast of the dead, which are alike prehistoric. But though they believed in a Paradise, they held the Buddhist view that its happiness was not eternal, and that souls returned to earth. Their prayers recall those of the Akkadians—"O merciful Lord, let this chastisement with which Thou hast visited us, Thy people, be as those which a father or mother inflicts on a child, not out of anger, but to the end that he may be free of follies and vices." But similar prayers are found among the Khonds.

The civilisation of Peru may have been distinct from that of Central America, but in many particulars it was similar. The Inca chiefs were a short-headed race, ruling subjects who were long-headed like other Americans. They are said to have spoken a language different from that of their subjects, though it is doubtful whether this was more than a dialectic difference. The temple services were thus conducted in a tongue not understood by the people. There had been only thirteen successive Incas[1] before Pizarro appeared, in 1524, so that the dynasty may have been founded in the thirteenth century at earliest. Ranking, indeed, in 1827, supposed that Manco-capac, the first Inca, was a son of the Mongol emperor Kublai Khan. The Inca tombs include statues of gold, with vessels of gold and silver, porphyry and granite, fine clay and copper. The pottery is marked with the familiar sign of the *swastika*, commonly used by Buddhists. The bodies are roughly mummified. The Peruvians had (like the Aztecs) quilted armour, and a postal system like that of Mongol Khans. Their messengers bore "quipus," or knotted cords of conventional meaning, and the use of such cords was not only very ancient in China, but is said to have continued even to our twelfth century. The Peruvians had also a system

[1] See Réville, "Hibbert Lectures," 1884, p. 160.

of hieroglyphics,[1] a specimen of which exists in the Cuzco Museum. There are about a hundred different signs, and when the commonest of these are compared with early Chinese signs the resemblances are often very striking.

Nor are the parallels in science, religious custom and belief less suggestive. The Peruvian Zodiac was the same that India received from the Greeks, and the Peruvian youth was endued with a sacred girdle like the Brahman. The divine emperor each year ploughed the first field with a gold plough, like Chinese emperors. Peruvian philosophy spoke of a female principle, or double, as in the Chinese Yan-yin philosophy. The widow of the Inca sacrificed herself at his death, and his subjects offered their children as vicarious sacrifices for his life. The Peruvian gods Yamo and Yama recall the Hindu Yama and Yami. The Peruvians also had ceremonies of lighting new fire, vestal virgins, and human sacrifices. They had a Deluge legend, and believed the soul to be immortal: they taught resurrection, and punishment in hell. The teacher of South America was a stranger from the East (perhaps from Yucatan) named Bochica, which is perhaps the Buddhist term *Pachcheko* or "saint." The Peruvians ate the flesh of the children whom they sacrificed, and they had a baptismal rite. They also believed in the successive destructions of the world by famine and flood. The whole system of Inca government and religion is easily explained on the supposition that a Mongol, or Malay, colony of Buddhist rulers was established among the natives of Peru. The wide influence of the Malays in Polynesia is traceable by both myths and customs, and the rude statues of Easter Island—not far west of the Peruvian coast—show the possibility of reaching South America from the Malay

[1] Elsworthy, "The Evil Eye," 1895, p. 282, *seq.*

peninsula. The general result of an inquiry into these two American civilisations seems thus to show that their origin is to be sought in the later Buddhist system of Asia, between 500 and 1200 A.D.; but the Americans generally brought prehistoric superstitions from Asia at some much earlier though unknown time. No doubt the borrowed civilisation had developed peculiarities of its own in America long before the Spaniards appeared, but its origin seems to have been Asiatic.

x. Islam.—Islam means "salvation," peace with God, and resignation to His will. Muhammad taught, like the later Rabbis, that every race had its prophet; that there was but one religion since the days of Abraham; and he said truly that Christians, Jews, and Magians alike had corrupted the truth, by teaching the traditions of men. We are still too much under the influence of mediæval prejudice in judging his teaching, and ancient calumnies are still revived by scholars who have not lived in Moslem countries. Islam was a revolt from contemporary superstition. It taught nothing new; but it discarded much that was due to reversion towards primitive errors. It triumphed because it united men of all creeds, by insisting on beliefs common to all; and because its author was sincere and simple-hearted, and addressed all openly, teaching no secret doctrine to a few initiates. Like other faiths, it has been corrupted by superstition; but it destroyed ecclesiasticism, and has maintained the truth that religion is a question for the individual conscience, and that man needs no priest to intercede for him with God.

Muhammad was born at Mecca in the "year of the elephant" (570 A.D.), when Abraha, the Christian viceroy of Yemen, advanced against the city with a force supported by thirteen elephants, but was repulsed by the

Koreish, among whom 'Abd-el-Muttalib (Muhammad's grandfather) was a leader. 'Abd-Allah, the father of this great religious genius, died before he was born, and though of good family was a poor man. His widow Amina also died soon after her son was born, and he was brought up by his grandfather, and by his uncle Abu-Taleb. The boy was delicate (some say epileptic) and highly imaginative—a true poet, whose love of nature is shown by similies which occur even in his latest compositions. He was sent for his health to tend goats among the Bedawin, and grew strong in the dry desert air. He accompanied his uncle to Bostra, in Bashan, on trading journeys, and afterwards gained the title Amīn ("faithful") as the agent of his rich cousin Khadijah, whom he married, though she was twenty years his senior, and to whom he remained faithful, and grateful to the end of his life. For in later years, when the young 'Aisha asked whether he did not love her more than old dead Khadijah, he exclaimed "No, by God! For she believed in me when none else did." During these journeys Muhammad's experience was enlarged by converse with Jews, Christians, and Persians; and as he was always intensely interested in religion he appears to have talked freely with them all. In Arabia also there were many Jews and Christians, and Persian traders, from whom he gathered the legends and beliefs of all Western Asia. But, like the Buddha, his clear mind saw that the underlying truths of their religions were crusted over with later corrupt additions.

At the age of forty Muhammad was a handsome black-haired man, "with teeth like hailstones" (as 'Aisha said), loved by his friends for his simplicity of manner, his courage, courtesy, faithfulness, piety, and modesty; and respected by all the Koreish tribe. He lived quietly with his one good wife, and remembered with gratitude the care of God in the past. The man

who could express this gratitude as he has done could not have been a religious impostor or scheming politician.

"By the noonday brightness. By the night when dark,
Thy Lord has not forsaken: He has not hated thee.
And surely shall the future be better still for thee.
Thy Lord shall prosper thee: thou shalt be satisfied.
Did not He find thee orphan, and give to thee a home?
He found thee straying, and He guided thee.
He found thee needy, and He made thee rich.
Therefore, the orphan, thou shalt never rob,
Shalt never chide the man that begs of thee.
Shalt tell abroad the mercies of thy Lord."[1]

Muhammad calls himself a Hanīf, or "convert," an Ammi, or "illiterate," and finally a Moslem, or one "saved."[2] Like other pious Arabs, he used to retire to the desert to fast and pray, during the month of Ramadān. It was while exhausted by such austerities, in the cave of Hira, that (in the year 610 A.D.) voices and visions haunted him and made him afraid. "Cry aloud," said the voice, "in the name of thy Creator";[3] and the "messenger" was seen "on the clear horizon"[4]—"the Spirit sent with a revelation."

"By the stars when they are setting
Your kinsman errs not, and is not astray.
This truly is no other than revealed revelation,
Taught him by One awful in power, full of wisdom.
Erect in form he stood on the horizon summit.
Then he came nearer and approached more nigh.
Two bowshots off, or even nearer still,
Revealing to his servant what he did reveal.
His heart mistook not what he saw.
Will you dispute with him of what he saw?

[1] Korān, chap. xciii.
[2] Chaps. xvi. 124, vii. 156, iii. 60.
[3] xcvi. 1.
[4] lxxxi. 23, xlii. 51, liii. 1–21. Allat, Al'Uzzah, Manat, were the three goddesses of Mecca, "the strong," "the mighty," and "the lucky."

Again he saw him by the boundary thorn,
Near which there is a garden of abode.
When that which hid the thorn-tree covered it
His gaze turned not aside, and wandered not.
He saw the greatest of his Master's signs.
How now of Allat, Al'Uzzah, Manat the third?
Shall ye have sons, and God have daughters only?
That would in sooth not be a fair division!
These are mere names you and your fathers gave."

But at first Muhammad doubted his visions—like Joan Darc—and feared that he was mad, or possessed by Satan. He went home and folded himself in his mantle to sleep—as all Arabs do—trembling with ague. But the voice pursued him still:

"O thou enwrapped, arise and warn."
"O thou enfolded, stand all night
With measured voice chant forth the Cry."[1]

Khadijah comforted him, believing him inspired, and the message broke forth in verses, at first only half articulate—the experience of his life—the chants which still ring over Moslem cities in the noonday stillness, when the Muedhdhin calls to prayer from the Mādhneh tower of a mosque. In later times there was one who more resembled Muhammad in simple-hearted piety than any others, and to whom the scripture was read as he was dying.[2] His faithful secretary tells us what Abu J'afer the reader reported. "I came to the words 'He is the God beside whom there is no god. He knows the seen and the unseen,' and I heard him utter the words 'It is true,' and this just as he was passing away—it was a sign of God's favour: thank God for it." Such, then, was the

[1] Chaps. lxxiv. 1, lxxiii. 1, 4.

[2] Beha ed Dīn, "Life of Salah-ed-Dīn," ii. 172–82; Korān, chap. lix. 22.

message of Muhammad, which he and Saladin alike believed.

"Praise be to God the Lord of worlds,
The merciful, the pitying,
The King of Doom's Day, merciful and pitying.
Thee we adore, and Thee we ask for help.
Show us the way that is made straight,
The way of those on whom is grace,
No wrath on them, nor do they stray."[1]

But this simple creed was not accepted by the Koreish. The guardians of the Ka'abah, or "square" sanctuary of Allat, with its wooden dove, its stone circle, its sandstone image of Hobal holding the arrows of fate in a hand of gold, its sacred well, and sacred black stone, feared—like other priests—that their power was about to be undermined, and that men would no longer come as pilgrims to Mecca. Abu Sofian, the head of the elder branch of that family to which Muhammad also belonged, denounced the new teacher as a madman, a sorcerer, a dreamer possessed by the devil, a mere poet, a retailer of old fables, a man whose compositions were all borrowed from others. For Muhammad had a good memory—as he tells us—and his verses (not yet written down) included references to many things he had heard. The Koreish said that the Persian story of Rustem was better than any of his. But they could not silence him, for all those who knew him best believed.

"What think you of him who makes doom's day a lie?
'Tis he who thrusts aside the orphan,
And urges none to feed the poor.
Woe then to those who pray indeed,
But who are careless of their prayers,
Who make a show of faith, but never help."[2]

[1] The *Fathah*, or chap. i.
[2] Korān, chaps. cvii., xlii. 35, cix. 1–6.

Muhammad wished to leave his enemies alone. He said that believers "when they are angered, forgive." The voice said to him:

> "Say. O ye unbelievers, my worship is not yours.
> Your worship is not mine. I worship not what you do.
> Your worship is not mine. To you your faith; to me my faith."

But six years after the first vision Khadijah died, and when her influence ceased the believers were strictly banned, and had to fly from Mecca to the north and to Abyssinia. Muhammad also fled to the cave of Mount Thaur on June 20, 622 A.D. (the era of the Hejirah or "flight"), and reached Medina a week later. For already twelve merchants of the rival city had sworn, at the 'Akabah (or "ascent") of Mecca, to worship one God, to refrain from theft, fornication, child sacrifices, and slander, and to obey the "messenger" of God. They welcomed him; and seventy-three men, with two women, now joined him and swore to defend his life. He built a little "praying-place" of mud and palm-tree posts, and married the young 'Aisha, daughter of his old friend Abu Bekr. He also wedded the widow of a convert who had gone to Abyssinia, and his life continued to be simple and kindly. He patched his own clothes, and helped his wives in household work. He did not desire to fight, until the Koreish attacked the northern city, which now cut off their trade with Syria. But his courage secured victory in wars which lasted eight years; and when the Meccans demanded a miracle, as a sign of his inspiration, he told them that the victory of Bedr was such a sign.[1] The people of Medina exiled the Hebrews who would not believe, and Muhammad's

[1] Korān, iii. 11, viii. 42. Bedr was a victory in December 623; Ohod a defeat in February 625; the battle of the ditch a defence in March 627. The Peace of Hodaibiya (March 628) was broken.

name was stained by the cruel slaughter of Jews at Khaibar; but at length he gained the right to visit Mecca with two thousand men; and though the Beni Khoza broke the truce in March 629, he finally entered unopposed into his native city with ten thousand believers in January 630 A.D., when he destroyed the idols of the Ka'abah. Two years later he died in the arms of 'Aisha at Medina, murmuring broken words about Paradise and the "blessed company on high." He had become a law-giver whose commands (obeyed all over Arabia) were summed up in inculcation of monotheism, prayer, alms, fasting, and pilgrimage. At the age of sixty-two he was worn out by twenty-two years of struggle. He commanded that his tomb should not be made a place of worship, because he was "a man like others," and was buried in his house close to the mosque he had built.

Muhammad knew nothing of Greek philosophy, which had been suppressed by the Christians and was equally hated by the Jews. He did not know that a thousand years before his time men had discovered that this earth is a globe turning on its axis. He thought it was a flat plain, surrounded by a mountain wall, with the ocean beyond: that there were seven heavens above the firmament, and seven hells beneath the world. Such were the usual beliefs of all Asiatics in his time. His imagination was full of the glories of the heavenly paradise, and of the terrors of hell, from which he believed himself and those who followed him to be saved. Paradise he pictured as a shady garden, where there was neither heat nor cold, and where the Hūris or "bright ones" were hidden in tents. These heavenly maidens were not first imagined by himself. They are noticed in the Persian hymns, much earlier,[1] as meeting the pious: they are the

[1] "Sacred Books of the East," xxiii.; "Yasht," xxii., and "Vistasp Yasht," pp. 314–21, 342–5.

Apsaras (or "water-movers") of the great Indian epic, who wed heroes in heaven; the Valkyries ("hero-choosers"), and swan maidens, of the Norse, which were the white clouds. The "bright" or "white" ones thus also meet the heroes who die for Islam.[1] In later years Muhammad speaks of them no more, but says that the faithful "shall enter with the just of their fathers and their wives and offspring": "the believing men and the believing women, in gardens where the rivers flow, dwelling for ever." Hell, on the contrary, is a land where flames arch over the heads of the damned; where boiling water scalds them; where the only food is the bitter fruit of the thorn tree.[2] The dread day of doom will for ever decide the fate of each, following the resurrection, when "the girl that has been buried alive shall be asked for what crime she was put to death," and when the "Rain of the Resurrection" shall quicken the dead—an idea borrowed, with many others, from the teachings of Jewish Rabbis, versed in the Talmud.[3] From Persia also Muhammad took the conception—which the Rabbis, too, had borrowed—of the terrible angels Munker and Nakīr, who examine the dead in the tomb.[4]

Muhammad only claimed to confirm the religion of "the Books of old," when "men were of one faith": for "every people had its apostle." But this "religion of Abraham" had been corrupted.[5] God gave Jesus the gospel (*Injil*): "We put into the hearts of those who followed him kindness and compassion, but as to the monkish life, they invented it themselves": "Nor have We sent any apostle or prophet, before thee, among whose aims Satan did not cast an aim":

[1] Korān, lvi. 10–39, xiii. 23, xlviii. 5.
[2] *Ibid.* lxxxviii. 4–6, lvi. 52.
[3] *Ibid.* lxxxi. 8, civ. 8, lxxv. 1, xxxv. 10.
[4] *Ibid.* lxxix. 1, l. 16–18.
[5] *Ibid.* lxxxvii. 18, x. 20, xxxv. 28, x. 48.

"Moreover the Jews say Ezra is a Son of God, and the Christians say the Messiah is a Son of God."[1]

"Say, He is one God: God everlasting:
Begetting not, and not begotten;
And there is none like Him."[2]

The tales which make up nearly half of the Korān appear to us to be wearisome and foolish; but the Arab loves to listen to such stories; and to most of Muhammad's hearers they were new. Those which treat of Adam, Cain, Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses and Aaron, Jethro, Saul, David, Solomon, Jonah, Ezekiel, and Elias, have been easily traced in the Talmud. The stories of the prophets Hud and Saleh were native; those about Christ and Mary, John the Baptist and the Apostles, were not taken from the New Testament, but from the Apocryphal Gospels, which were then popular as tending to exalt the worship of the Virgin, and to support the dogma of her perpetual virginity. Stories about Gog and Magog, Alexander of the two horns, and the mysterious "green one" (El Khidr), seem to be Persian. Muhammad speaks also of Lokman—the Arab Æsop—and had heard the Byzantine legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. In every instance the intention of the story is to show the punishment that fell on those who rejected former prophets; and most of these tales belong to the twelve years when he was disputing, with the Koreish at Mecca, his claim to be regarded as an inspired messenger of God. His conception of Jesus was that of the Gnostics—He was the Incarnate Word, yet man, eating and drinking, but not really crucified; dying and rising again: yet—

"Praise be to God. He has no son.
He shares not the rule of the universe.
He needs no helper. Proclaim His greatness."[3]

[1] Korān, lvii. 27, xxii. 51, ix. 30. [2] *Ibid.* cxii.
[3] *Ibid.* xvii. 112. As written in the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem.

Muhammad utterly denied the dogma of the Trinity, yet believed that Jesus sent down a table out of heaven—if we may hold that the Korān was entirely his work, and that nothing was added by others.

The legend of Muhammad grew apace after his death, and many superstitions were based on short obscure references. Thus he spoke of the "night of Power . . . when all is peace till dawn," and of "the far-off sanctuary," by which he meant, probably, Medina.[1] But Moslem legends tell of his flying to Jerusalem on the "lightning" cherub, adoring God with the dead prophets of the past in the cave of the holy rock, and flying through its roof to the seventh heaven, where nought is seen and nought heard, save the creaking of the pen that writes men's fates on the night of Power each year. They show Muhammad's footprint, and the print of Gabriel's fingers when he held back the sacred rock which would fain have followed the ascending prophet. Muhammad also spoke of a "monster"[2] who is to come out of earth in the last days—the Beast of more than one Jewish Apocalypse—and on this illusion is founded a long eschatological legend, which borrows from Persian as well as from Jewish and Christian sources. But, though much was thus added to his teaching, Muhammad had a firm belief in the "stoned Satan" (a Persian idea), and in demons and jinns who steal the secrets of heaven, listening behind the veil—a Talmudic fancy.

Muhammad says distinctly that the Korān was not a parchment dropped from heaven; but he regarded the outbursts of a wild poetic imagination, fed by all that he had heard, as inspired. He spoke of the "mother of the book"[3]—its source which was with

[1] Korān, xcvii. 1–4, xliv. 1, xvii. 1.
[2] *Ibid.* xxvii. 84. See Sale's "Korān," Introduction.
[3] *Ibid.* xv. 17–18.

God—but he regarded it as an Arab version of ancient truths, "made plain" in Arabic for the ignorant, by an "unlettered" messenger.[1] The early poems were learned by heart, and some, it seems, were not written down till after his death. Ninety were composed at Mecca before the flight: twenty-four were added later at Medina. In 634 A.D. Abu Bekr, the first Khalifah (or "successor"), collected all of them, and Zaid Ibn Thabit wrote them out from palm-leaves, tablets, sheep's blade-bones—penned by the scribes—or took them in other cases from "the minds of men." Those thought most important were set first, and thus—just as we place the Gospels before the Epistles—the historic sequence, though preserved by tradition, was obscured. Small glosses and alterations crept in before the final text was settled, and these are often easy to trace. But as a whole the Korān bears the stamp of one mind, though the poet gradually becomes the lawgiver and teacher. No attempt was made to suppress discordant passages, for Muhammad himself taught that new revelation was granted him under altered circumstances. The authorised text was finally approved by the Khalifah Othmān, about twenty years after the prophet's death.

Intolerance of other religions was not natural to Muhammad. "To its own Book," he said, "shall every nation be summoned": "Muslims and Jews and Christians and Sabiun ('baptists'), who believe in God and in the last day, and do what is right, shall have their reward from their Lord": "Jews and Sabiūn and Christians and Magians, and those who join other gods to God, truly God will decide between in the day of Resurrection." The choice between the Korān and the sword was only offered by later fanatics (Persian or Turkish); and persecution of Christians is contrary to the original teaching. At

[1] Korān, xliii. 2, xiii. 39.

first Muhammad spoke kindly of the Jews: "Dispute not save in kindness with the people of the Book"; and later, when he bade his followers not to be intimate with unbelievers, he still had a good word to say even of monks.[1] "You will certainly find the Jews, and those who add gods to God, the most bitter haters of those who believe, and will surely find to be nearest in affection those who say 'We are Christians': for some such, though priests and monks, are free from pride."

Islam not only proclaimed a pure theism, and a simple piety (teaching the fortitude and patient submission to the will of God which distinguish Moslems), but it did much also for Arab ethics. The Moslem prays by himself or with others, but has no priest as mediator with heaven. He speaks of the Kismah, or "lot" appointed to him, but disputes about free will and fate like the Christian. He is forbidden to drink wine or to gamble, and bidden to fast, pray, and go as a pilgrim to the old centre which, under Muhammad, made the Arabs "one people." The prophet did not make any sweeping social changes. If he allowed slaves, so did Christians till less than a century ago, and they quoted the Bible in defence. If he permitted polygamy, yet he did much to secure the rights of wives and daughters; and Christian Europe was also polygamous, though it only recognised one wife by law. Muhammad bade men treat slaves kindly, and he set free some of his own. Most of his later wives (when he was over fifty) were widows, to whom he gave a home when left destitute. Polygamy is a great evil, but the collection of women in a Harīm was unknown to free Arabs, and women still hold a position among them not unlike that of their European sisters. They were bidden to be modest in public, but were not imprisoned at home. Seclusion, indeed,

[1] Korān, xlv. 27, ii. 59, xxii. 17, v. 85.

has nothing to do with religion: it is a difference of racial custom between Semitic and Aryan peoples. Moslem women go out to the shops even when they are of high rank, and it is only among the rich that a man can afford more than one wife. Like the Babylonians, he takes a second when he has no children by the first; but Moslem women view with disgust the free mingling of the sexes, which was always an Aryan custom. The characteristic of good Moslem society is the simple sincerity with which their faith is expressed by word and deed in daily life, and they have not learned, as we have, to hide religion in the heart.

The laws of Muhammad developed gradually, as his power and influence grew. His first anxiety was to put an end to the cruel practice of burying girls alive, either as sacrifices to the "mothers"—the three goddesses of Mecca—or because of poverty.[1] He also inculcated kindness to parents, duty to kinsmen, to the poor, and to wayfarers. He denounced adultery, and murder, and the wronging of orphans. He bade men "weigh with a just balance," and "not to walk proudly on earth," but to "pray at sunset."[2] At Medina his position was that of an accepted leader; and in the Medina surahs (or "chapters") he is called not only the "messenger" (*Rasūl*), or apostle, but also the *Neby* or "inspired one"; as such he claimed to be respected by the faithful, yet he says: "Muhammad is only a messenger; other messengers have passed away before him; if then he die or be slain, will you turn back?" He is the "seal of the prophets," predicted of old as the one "praised by the nations."[3] His later laws appear to have political objects, con-

[1] Korān, lxxxi. 8, xvii. 33, vi. 152.

[2] *Ibid.* xvii. 20–39, 81.

[3] *Ibid.* iii. 138, xxxiii. 1, viii. 65, xxxiii. 40, xxiv. 63, lxi. 6; Haggai ii. 7.

ciliating the Koreish and uniting the tribes. He had no belief in turning to pray in any particular direction, for "the East and the West are God's"; yet he allowed the faithful to face towards the "station of Abraham" (the Kiblah) at Mecca, and to regard the hills of Safa, Marwa, and 'Arafát as sanctuaries. He retained the old fast of Ramadán, the pilgrimage, and even the ancient sacrifices—though "by no means can their flesh reach God, nor their blood." He also sanctioned the blood-feud, and claimed the right to apportion the spoils of war. He made it obligatory to arrange loans by written agreement—like the Babylonians—and exhorted his followers "to fight in the path of God." He allowed four wives, and settled the rights of women generally; and finally he made a very ignorant decision as to the Calendar, going back to a lunar year.[1] But while we see clearly the limitations of Islam, and the simplicity of Muhammad, we feel the more astonishment that such reformation should have come from the desert. It was the outcome of ancient civilisation as seen by genius with fresh eyes.

Within two centuries after Muhammad died great changes occurred in the belief of the more cultivated Moslems. They became acquainted first with Greek philosophy, and afterwards with Hindu mysticism, and the result was the appearance of the Sufis or "wise men" (the Greek *Sophoi*) in Persia.[2] The name at first only denoted one who studied Greek science and philosophy, but by 800 A.D. it applied to those who discarded the popular theology, and accepted the wisdom of the Buddhists of Bactria, and of Hindu Brahmans and Yogis. The Sufi was one "content," and "longing for God." They wrote poems of a most extraordinary nature—divine love-songs like those

[1] Korān, ii., xxii., lvii., iv., ix. 36.

[2] See Nicholson, in *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, April 1906, pp. 303-48.

of the worshippers of Krishna. They practised the ancient hypnotism, and believed that they attained to union with deity. They founded orders, with novices and initiates, teaching absolute obedience to the chief. In the tenth century A.D. Bayazid of Bistam was a Moslem pantheist, believing in self-annihilation (*Fana*), and apparently mad with ecstasy. "I went," he said, "from god to god till they cried from me in me 'O Thou I'"; "I am God"; "I am Love, the throne, the tablet, the pen"; "I made my heart a mirror; for a year I gazed; I saw all created things dead; by God's aid I attained to God."

From this diseased mysticism there was then a natural reversion to pure scepticism. In the reign of Melek Shah, the Turkish emperor, the Batanīn or "inner" sects flourished. They founded their rejection of Moslem beliefs on a single passage in the Korān, where we read: "He sent down to thee the Book. Some of its signs are clear—these are the Mother of the Book—and others are figurative."[1] They revived the old Gnostic and Platonic teaching—that of the Greek mysteries—and held that the wise, while not believing, should outwardly conform to the creed of the ignorant. Three famous sceptics made friends on this basis. Nizām-el-Mulk, the vizier of Melek Shah, Omar Khayyām, the well-known poet, and Hasan el Homeiri, the founder of the notorious sect of the Hashshāshīn, or smokers of Indian hemp. In 1090 the last-named was disgraced, and retired to the fortress of Alamut ("eagle's nest"), near Kasbin, in Irak, where he gathered followers who vowed implicit obedience. Whether the story of the earthly paradise, to which he admitted youthful enthusiasts for a few days, be true or legendary, there is no doubt that he succeeded in establishing a most dangerous secret society. Two years later Melek Shah and

[1] Korān, iii. 5.

Nizām-el-Mulk fell victims to the daggers of the assassins; and in the twelfth century we find the sect in the Lebanon—where a few still remain. Their chiefs terrorised Moslems and Christians alike. They attempted the life of Saladin and of Edward I.: for, in the latter case, the unscrupulous Sultan Bibars was in alliance with them. They were finally put down in the East by Mengku Khān.

This political conspiracy was not the only result of Moslem scepticism, and many other sects appeared, all teaching secret doctrines and public dogmas. The most famous and influential of these were the Druzes,[1] or Muwahhadīn ("uniters"), who appeared in Egypt under the mad Khalif Hākim about 1014 A.D. The higher initiates were sceptics who attempted to unite Moslems, Jews, Christians, Magians, and Buddhists by teaching a system of "emanations" in which they had no real belief. The secret teaching of Hamzah—the Druze leader—is contained in the "Book of Concealed Destruction," which substitutes for Moslem laws the seven rules of Truth, Secrecy, Mutual Aid, the Renunciation of Dogma, the Oneness of God, Submission, and Resignation. In the twelfth century this sect spread from Constantinople to India, and from Syria to Egypt and Arabia.

The Dervish orders of the present day[2] represent the survival of such secret societies. They arose in Bactria and Persia in the middle ages, and always consist of a lower and higher class of initiates. Those who see the naked ascetic treading on fire, or eating scorpions; or watch the more dignified Malawiyeh performing their stately dance; or hear the *Zikr* cries, when the hypnotised fanatics repeat the name of Allah till they foam at the mouth and bark

[1] For details see my "Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem," 1897, pp. 229–37.

[2] See Lane, "Modern Egyptians," 1871, i. p. 305.

like dogs, do not always understand that behind all this mysticism lies the policy of cool-headed leaders, who have no religious belief beyond some vague form of pantheism, but who—like the Jesuits of the West—use the abject obedience of their ignorant devotees for purposes of state, supporting or opposing sultans and kings according to their conceptions of interest or statecraft. It is on these subtle influences that the power of the Turkish Khalifah—himself an initiate—really rests.

In India the development of Islam produced equally remarkable results. The difference between the Shiáh (or "sectarian"), and the Sunni (or follower of "tradition"), was ancient and originally political, according as the believer accepted 'Ali (the Prophet's son-in-law) and his descendants, or acknowledged the Khalifah of Damascus. In time the Shiáh, or Persian Moslems, became mystical and superstitious. Their weeping for Hasan and Hosein—whose real history was quite unlike their legend—became a form of hysterical revivalism of the most terrible brutality, based on the ancient Babylonian weeping for Tammuz, which survived among the peasantry till our ninth century. But the influence of Indian philosophy on the Moslem Sufis, and of the Sufis on the Hindus, had its outcome in various attempts to develop a universal religion which might unite all mankind. Nanak,[1] the prophet of the Sikhs (or "disciples"), was influenced both by Moslem ascetics and by the Hindu mystics of Benares. About 1520 A.D., as the result of a trance, he proclaimed that "there is no Hindu, and no Moslem, but one God the Father of all." He succeeded in converting many of both faiths to this simple belief; but he added Sufi ideas, saying: "Thou art I; I am Thou." Arjun, the fourth successor of Nanak, completed the older Granth, which

[1] See Forlong, "Faiths of Man," 1906, iii. p. 291: *s.v. Sikhs.*

is the latest of the world's Bibles, in 1600, while a second Granth was added a century later by Govind-Singh, the founder of the warlike Sikh kingdom in Scinde.

Moslem sects are innumerable, and as much divided as are Christians. The latest recrudescence of the old mysticism appeared in Persia, where the leader, called the Bāb (or "door"), was born in 1820. He proclaimed his inspiration in 1844, and after a futile miracle was shot in 1850. Two years later the Bābis fled to Constantinople, and split into two sects—the Ezeli, who were exiled to Cyprus, and the followers of Beha-Allah, who died in prison at Acre in 1892. The latter regard his son Abbas Efendi as the present incarnation of deity. The only real attempt at reform in Islam was that of the Puritanical Wahhābis[1] in Arabia, whose founder ('Abd el Wahhāb) died in 1787. Their brave leader 'Abd-Allah was treacherously beheaded at Constantinople in 1818; but the sect, which aims at restoring the primitive austerity of Muhammad's age, is still powerful in Arabia, and spread to India in 1812. Its teaching is too strict for general acceptance; but much good has been done in Gujerāt by Wahhābi reforms.

Our survey of historic religions is thus brought down to our own times through five thousand years of recorded beliefs. Each faith was founded, as we see, on that which went before—as our own faith is founded on that of the Hebrews. From savage superstition man rose slowly to the conception of an infinite Intelligence animating the universe. Buddhism first taught the Law of Love: Islam has taught the priestless faith. The former fails to understand Providence: the latter fails in sympathy. Something yet greater remained for man to learn; and to this we now must turn at last.

[1] See Lane, "Modern Egyptians," i. p. 137.

CHAPTER V

THE HEBREWS

i. History.—Pride of race, and pride in faith, have made the Hebrews a separate people from the days when the daughters of Heth were a "grief of mind" to Isaac and Rebecca, and still keep them separate as a nation even without a land of their own. Hence their history and their religion may be treated separately, and we now possess means of independent study which did not exist half a century ago.

The first contemporary notices of the Hebrews are probably found in five of the six letters of a king of Jerusalem, in the fifteenth century B.C., which belong to the Amarna collection at Berlin.[1] His name is doubtful,[2] but that of the city is certain. The date is about the time when Joshua invaded Palestine, according to the Bible. The people called *'Abiri* (Hebrews) in these letters are only mentioned in the south of Palestine, and are not named by any writer except this king. The important passages may be rendered as follows:[3]

"To the King my Lord thus says 'Abd-tsadik thy

[1] This name appears clearly to be geographical. The doubts cast on the identification with the Hebrews, by some scholars, are mainly due to the old theory—founded on Manetho—which would make the Exodus occur later than the time mentioned in the Bible.

[2] Berlin Collection, Nos. 102, 103, 104, 106, 199. The king's name is written *UR-KHI-BA*, to be read probably either *'Abd-tsadik*, or *Adoni-tsadik*: "Servant of the just," or "My lord is just."

[3] Berlin, No. 102.

servant: at the feet of my Lord the King I bow seven times, and seven times. What have I done to the King my Lord? They have prevailed with you to seize the guilty one. An enemy says, in the presence of the King of kings, that 'Abd-tsadik has rebelled against the King his Lord. Behold, as for me, I have no father and no friends to support me in this place. They rebel, great King, striving with me for my father's house. Why should I sin against the King of kings? Behold, O King my Lord, I swear I said to the chief (*Paca*)[1] of the King of kings, 'Why are ye afraid of the Hebrews, and the rulers afraid to go out?' And so they have sent to the presence of the King my Lord. Lo, I say the lands of the King my Lord are ruined, as they sent to the King my Lord. And let the King my Lord know. Lo, the King my Lord has decided that the garrison should go: the garrison (has gone) to his land. The lands of the King of kings have revolted; all that Ilimelech has wasted of the King's land: and let the King guard his land. I speak pleading this with the King my Lord, and let the King my Lord regard these laments. And the wars are mighty against me, and I have received no letter from the King my Lord, or commands commanded in presence of the King my Lord. Let him give orders for a garrison, and let him be friendly, and let him regard lamentations. O King my Lord, King of kings, arise. Lo, they have expelled the chief. I say the lands of the King my Lord are ruined. Will not you hear me? They have destroyed all the rulers: there is no ruler for the King my Lord. Let the King give countenance to the governors, and order bowmen.[2] O King my Lord, not one is in the lands of the King. The

[1] An Egyptian word, "chief man."

[2] *Pitati*, the Egyptian *pet*, "bow"; or otherwise "infantry," from *pet*, "foot."

Hebrew has plundered all the King's lands. When the bowmen went away this year, quitting the lands of the King-Lord, and when there was not one bowman, the lands of the King my Lord were ruined. To the scribe of the King my Lord thus says 'Abd-tsadik: this is my plea for soldiers: the lands of the King my Lord are plundered."

Again we read[1] of "that which Milcilu and Suardatu have done as to the land of the King my Lord. They hired soldiers of Gezer, and soldiers of Gimtu. They seized the city Rabbah. The King's land has revolted to the Hebrews, and now against the chief city Jerusalem the city called Beth Baal has revolted, and has (ordered?) the men of Keilah." Yet again an urgent request for soldiers is sent to Egypt,[2] with the following protest: "Lo, the King my Lord has established his fame from the rising to the setting of the sun. The slander against me is false. Lo, am not I a ruler, one near to the King my Lord, and I have sent tribute? As for me, no one joins me, no one is my friend, standing steady for the great King in this Beth Amil" (or "palace"). "I have sent ten slaves to Suta, the King's chief, as he demanded of me, twenty-one female slaves, twenty prisoners of ours left in the hands of Suta to be led captive to the King, as the King commanded his land. All the land taken from me in wars against me is ruined. They have gathered from the lands of Seir to the city Hareth Carmel, to all the rulers, and have fought against me." "They fight against me persistently. Lo, a ship is prepared in the sea. O mighty King, you marched to Naharaim and Casib, and lo they are fortresses of the King. You will march on the Hebrews. There is not a single ruler for the King my Lord; they have destroyed them all. Behold, they have cut off Turbazu in the city Zilu; and

[1] Berlin, 106. [2] *Ibid.* 104.

Zimrida, of the city Lachish, the slaves wore out and put to death." No answer seems to have been made to these entreaties, and a letter apparently sent later appeals to the king's scribe not to keep back the news.[1] "They war against all lands that have been at peace with me. Let the King guard his land. Lo, the land of Gezer, the land of Ashkelon, and the land of Lachish, have given them corn and oil and all else; and they have carried much away. Let bowmen be sent against men who have sinned against the King my Lord. If bowmen go out this year, and go out to the lands, the ruler will be for the King my Lord. If there are no bowmen, no city and no rulers will be for the King. Behold this city of Jerusalem: neither chief nor people support me, or prepare to support me. Lo, it is done to me as to Milcilu, and the sons of Labaya, who gave the King's land to the Hebrews. Behold, the King my Lord will be just to me, for the men are sorcerers. Let the King ask the chiefs (*Pacas*); behold, they are strong, and many, and violent in all sin, destroying property, and dealing death": "they took from the lands of the city Ashkelon—let the King ask them—much corn and oil: they revolted as far as the government of Pauru, the King's chief for the city Jerusalem": "men have been sent along the roads . . . they have wasted the city of Ajalon—let the King my Lord know." "To the scribe of the King my Lord thus says 'Abd-tsadik thy servant. I bow at thy feet. I am thy servant. Translate the messages well to the King my Lord. O scribe of the King, I am afflicted, great is my affliction, and you do what is not loyal to the men of Cush." The last letter is now in the Gizeh museum,[2] and gives further details of the invasion. "Now the city of Jerusalem has been faithful to the King since they left these

[1] Berlin, 103. [2] *Ibid.* 199.

lands. The city of Gaza has stuck to the King. Behold the land of Hareth Carmel, belonging to Tagi, and the chief of Keilah, are smitten": "Milcilu sent to the Hebrews for tribute, and the fellows said, 'Is it not to be paid to us?' They did their will with the people of Keilah, and will the city of Jerusalem escape? The men of the garrison, whom you ordered, are in fear of this fellow, whom I fear. . . . Addasi has remained in his house in the city of Gaza (sending) the women to the land of Egypt (to the care) of the King. Give this to the King."

After these important notices of the Hebrew conquest of southern Palestine, we find a casual allusion to Israel in the records of Mineptah (Merenptah), the son of Rameses II., who repulsed the Aryan invaders of Syria about 1270 B.C. He says, "The people of Israel is spoiled, it has no seed."[1] Again we find a record of the cities taken by Shishak, on the death of Solomon, about 960 B.C.[2] But still more important is the testimony of the Moabite Stone, found at Dibon in 1868, representing the Moabite version of the conquests of King Mesha, in alphabetic writing, and in a dialect which, though very close to Hebrew, is yet marked by Aramaic forms.[3]

"I am Mesha, son of Chemosh-Melech, king of Moab, the Dibonite. My father was king over Moab thirty years, and I have reigned after my father, and have made this monument for Chemosh in Kirhah for the saving of Mesha. Because he has saved me from all

[1] Published by Dr. F. Petrie in *Contemporary Review*, May 1896.

[2] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii. p. 208. There were about a hundred and thirty-three towns taken, including Taanach and Haphraim in Galilee, with Gibeon, Beth-horon, Ajalon, Makkedah, Jehud, Alemeth, Socoh, Beth Tappuah, Adoraim, Arad, and Beth Anoth, in the south. The last broken name (*Iur* . . .) may have been that of Jerusalem itself.

[3] Such as the masculine plural in *n*, instead of the Hebrew *m*, with a voice of the verb known in Assyrian but not in Hebrew.

the kings, and because he has made me look down on all my foes. Omri was king of Israel, and oppressed Moab many days; for Chemosh was wroth with his land. And his son succeeded him, and said also, 'Lo! I will oppress Moab.' In my day he said thus, and I looked on him, and on his house, and Israel has perished, perished for ever. And Omri possessed all the land of Medeba and dwelt therein: his day and half the days of his son were forty years. And Chemosh restored it in my day. And I have built Baal-meon, and made its ditch, and have built Kiriathain. And the men of Gad dwelt in the land of 'Ataroth from of old, and the king of Israel built 'Ataroth for them, and I attacked the fort and took it, and slew all the people in the fort in sight of Chemosh and Moab. And I took thence the champion Dodah, and destroyed him in the sight of Chemosh in Kerith, and I took there the men of the plain, and another people. And Chemosh said to me, 'Go, take Nebo from Israel,' and I went by night and fought there from daybreak to noon and took it, and I slew them all, seven thousand, strong men and boys, women and maidens and girls: for to 'Astar-Chemosh I devoted it. And I took thence the champions of Jehovah, and destroyed them in sight of Chemosh. And the king of Israel built Yahaz, and dwelt there in the wars with me; and Chemosh drove him out from before me, and I took of Moab two hundred men in all, and led to Yahaz and took it, that I might join it to Dibon. And I have built Kirhah, the outer wall, and the wall of the mound, and I have built its gates, and I have built its towers, and I have built the king's house, and I have made the vessels of the excavations within the fort. And there was no well in the fort at Kirhah, and I said to all the people, 'Make you every man a well in his house.' And I have cut the scarps of Kirhah as defences from Israel. And I have built

Aroer, and I have made the ascent at Arnon, and I have built Beth Bamoth which was ruined. Lo! I have built Bezer, prepared as a spring for Dibon. For all Dibon is obedient. And I have reigned in a hundred cities, which I have added to the land. And I have built Medeba, and Beth Diblathain, and Beth Baal-meon, and made sheepfolds there in the land. And in Horonain dwelt Ben Dedan. . . . And Chemosh said to me, 'Go fight with Horonain,' and I turned and fought."

The last lines are broken; but the monument refers clearly to the revolt of Moab in the time of Ahab and after his death.[1] We learn from it that the cruelty of the Moabites was as great as that of the early Hebrews, and that Jehovah was already regarded as the national God of Israel. We see that alphabetic writing was already in use for monuments as early as about 900 B.C., and that Moabite was already a dialect distinct from Hebrew. The whole style of the text reminds us of the Old Testament, but the Moabites adored more than one god, and boasted of the destruction of Israel, which other monuments show us not to have been as complete as Mesha pretends. The notice of Gad agrees exactly with the Bible, and so does that of sheep, for Mesha was a "sheep-master."[2]

The confirmations of Biblical notices by Assyrian texts are well known. In 840 B.C. Jehu gave tribute to Shalmaneser, and Azariah of Judah to Tiglath-pileser a century later. He is noticed as having stirred up rebellion in Hamath, or Syria, which agrees also with the Bible.[3] The names of Menahem, Pekah, and Hoshea, as kings of Israel, are mentioned by Tiglath-pileser, with those of Azariah and Ahaz of Judah. The destruction of Samaria by Sargon is also recorded

[1] 2 Kings iii. 4-27. [2] Num. xxxii. 34; 2 Kings iii. 4.
[3] 2 Kings xiv. 28.

by that invader, in 722 B.C.; but the most important Assyrian notice is that of Hezekiah, in 702 B.C. "As for Kha-za-ki-yahu (Hezekiah), of the land Yā-hu-dā (Judah), who did not submit to my yoke: forty-six of his cities, strong forts, and villages in their limits, of unknown name, I took by destroying ramparts, and by open attack, fighting on foot, hewing in pieces, casting down. I took 200,150 males and females: horses, mules, camels, oxen, and flocks unnumbered, I took as spoil. He himself like a bird in a snare shut himself up in Jerusalem, his royal city. He erected fortifications for himself: he was forced to close the exit of the gate of his city. . . . Beyond the former tribute their yearly gift I imposed on them a gift of subjection to my government in addition. Fear of the glory of my rule overpowered this Hezekiah. The priests, the trusty warriors whom they had brought in to defend Jerusalem his royal city, gave tribute. Thirty talents of gold, eight hundred talents of molten silver, many rubies and sapphires, thrones of ivory, high seats of ivory, skins of wild bulls, horns of wild bulls, weapons of all kinds—a mighty treasure—and women of his palace, slaves and handmaids, he caused to be sent after me to Nineveh my royal city; and he sent his envoy to make submission." Sennacherib thus testifies to the wealth and courage of Hezekiah, but forgets to explain why he himself returned so suddenly to Nineveh without taking the capital of Judah.

The inscription found by a Jewish boy, in 1880, near the mouth of the rock tunnel which leads from Gihon to Siloam, and which was cut, we are told, by Hezekiah,[1] was carved on a smooth rock face in letters of the ancient Hebrew alphabet, which differ slightly in some forms from those of the Moabite stone, but which are certainly early. The contents of the text

[1] 2 Kings xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.

are not very important, but the fact of its existence is most instructive. "The cutting. And this was the method of the cutting: while . . . the pick towards each other three cubits still . . . one calling to another; for there was an excess of rock to the right . . . in the day of cutting. They hewed this mine each towards the other, pick to pick. And the waters flowed from the spring to the pool for twelve hundred cubits; and one hundred cubits was the height above this mine." My own researches in the tunnel when surveying it and taking the first correct copy of the text, in 1881, showed that it was cut by two parties working from the spring and from the pool; and I found that at the point of junction the two mines were out of line by about three cubits, at a point where they were joined by a short cross-cut east and west. This discovery makes the meaning of the text clear. Its importance lies in its testimony to the use of the alphabet at Jerusalem, and of a pure Hebrew language, about 700 B.C. Taken in conjunction with Sennacherib's account of Hezekiah's wealth, it shows us that Hebrew civilisation was, in that age, equal to that of surrounding nations. It is the last monumental record as yet known—with exception of the passing allusion by Assur-bani-pal to Manasseh as a tributary—that refers to the Hebrews before the Babylonian captivity.

There are, however, other remains of the same age which cast further light on this civilisation. Weights, inscribed in the same letters used at Siloam, show us that the Hebrew shekel (of 320 grains) differed from that of Babylon, though commensurate. Seals discovered in Jerusalem give names compounded with that of Jehovah, some of which are apparently older than the Captivity. In one case the influence of surrounding symbolism is shown by the winged sun engraved above and below the name, but generally

speaking these seals are remarkable for the absence of those mythological figures which are common on Phœnician and Assyrian seals and seal cylinders.[1] In like manner the rude stone monuments of the Canaanites, which are so common on the surface in Moab, are found west of Jordan only in remote corners of Galilee, or deep down at the foundations of such towns as Gezer and Gath. It seems clear that they were destroyed in the west by the Hebrews. Nor do we find in Palestine any bas-reliefs which represent Canaanite deities, though they occur at Damascus and in Phœnicia. It is only at the bottom of excavations that Canaanite cylinder seals, phallic emblems, and small idols of bronze and of pottery, occur—representing the remains of pre-Hebrew ages. The Canaanites, we know, wrote in cuneiform characters on clay tablets, and the recent discovery of two such tablets at Gezer, bearing Hebrew names and dated by the Assyrian date answering to 649 B.C., proves to us that this character continued to be used, at least for purposes of trade with Assyria, by natives of Palestine some centuries after the introduction of the alphabet—a fact which is of great importance for Bible criticism. The survival of Canaanite superstition among the peasantry, down to about the same age, is also proved by the recovery of jar handles with dedicatory words—the names of the various local Molochs of the chief towns, and that of Moloch-Mamshath, "the ruler of that which is drawn forth." These no doubt, in the belief of the peasants, protected the pitcher from being broken when lowered by such a handle into the well.

[1] Perrot and Chipiez, "Histoire de l'Art," iv. p. 439 seal of Shebnaiah son of 'Azziu. The same work gives also the seal of Shem'a-yahu son of 'Azar-yahu with the figure of a bull, and that of Nathan-yahu, son of 'Abd-yahu with two goats. These also appear to be Hebrew, and the characters are earlv.

The sack of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar has not as yet been found noticed in any of his records, though his advance on Palestine is witnessed by texts in the Lebanon and at Beirut. But the presence of the Hebrews in Chaldea as traders, during the later Babylonian age and down to the time of Artaxerxes II., is clearly shown by tablets including distinctive Hebrew names such as Abraham and Jacob, or (in the later reign) Yahu-lacim and Yahu-lunu.[1] The monuments are otherwise silent as to Israel, when dispersed and subject to Babylonians and Persians, and it is not until the second century B.C. that we as yet have further evidence of Hebrew history. The oldest known Hebrew building is the palace which was erected by a priest named Hyrcanus, at Tyrus in Gilead, beside a cliff in which he excavated cave dwellings and stables. He lived there for seven years, and—out of fear when Antiochus the Great invaded this region—he slew himself in 176 B.C. The description given by Josephus[2] of these works agrees with the existing remains at 'Arāk el Emīr—a cliff beside a fine torrent flanked by tall oleander bushes. The palace was built of huge masonry, and lions are rudely carved at the angles. The roof was supported on pillars with peculiar capitals, but the drafted masonry, and the details of cornices, show that Greek influence was already strong among the Jews. A short text in letters like those of the earlier Jewish coins flanks the entrance to the caves, and appears to read "'Aurith" or "Watchfulness."[3] The coins of the

[1] Hilprecht ("Babylonian Expedition," 1898, ix. p. 27) gives forty-three such names. The name of *Yahu* (Jehovah) was already known to the Assyrians, as well as to the Moabites, as early as 900 B.C. Pinches, in "Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc.," November 1885, p. 28, and November 1892.

[2] "Antiq.," XII. iv. 11.

[3] See details in my "Memoir of the Survey of Eastern Palestine," 1889, pp. 65–87.

Jews begin with those of Simon, brother of Judas Maccabæus, and continue till the time of the Procurators. The most remarkable fact illustrated by them is the restored Greek influence on the rulers of the nation after 105 B.C. For while the first coins are inscribed in Hebrew only, those of Alexander Jannæus bear also in Greek the name "Alexander the King," while after his death in 78 B.C. the coins of his widow were inscribed in Greek alone, "Queen Alexandra." Antigonus, the last of this great Hasmonean family who united the two offices of High Priest and King, has left coins also which bear the Hebrew legend "Mattathiah the High Priest and the Jewish confederacy," while on the reverse we find in Greek, "Of King Antigonos."[1]

Ruins, coins, and texts of the Herodian age are numerous, and serve again to show a strong Greek influence. The mighty outer walls of Herod's temple at Jerusalem are still standing; and, though the huge stones are marked with Hebrew letters, the style of the masonry—resembling that already mentioned at Tyrus—was copied from that of the Acropolis at Athens. Herod also built a temple to Baal-samin at Siá, in Bashan, the ruins of which still remain with the altar before its gate. It resembled the Jerusalem temple in having an outer court, and a vine carved round its door; but the bust of the god above the plinth, and the figures of lions, horses, and gazelles, with the eagle of the lintel stone, are evidence that Herod—who built temples to Augustus at Cæsarea and Samaria—was not a follower of the "law of Moses." To the same Herodian age are to be attributed the Greco-Jewish tombs of the Kidron valley, one of which bears the names of the Beni Hezir family of priests; and this long text proves that the usual characters for writing Hebrew were then

[1] See Madden, "Jewish Coinage," 1864, p. 63.

early forms of what we now know as "square Hebrew," the ancient alphabet having been gradually abandoned about a century before. The famous Greek text forbidding strangers to enter the inner court at Jerusalem, with others from Bashan and from Philistia, show us that in the time of our Lord there was a Greek-speaking population in Palestine. The medals struck by Vespasian, and the representation of the seven-branched lamp and table of shew-bread on the Arch of Titus at Rome, are the witnesses of the final destruction of Jerusalem. A text of the time of Trajan proves that about 100 A.D. Serapis was publicly worshipped at Jerusalem—that strange "King of the Sea" from Pontus, who deposed Osiris in Egypt, and was adored as the supreme deity even in Rome.

The scarped cliffs of the village of Bether, near Jerusalem on the south-west, witnessed the last desperate struggle of the Jews for faith and freedom in 135 A.D. But after this massacre Hadrian rebuilt Jerusalem as the "Colony of Ælia"; and his arch of triumph still stands north-west of the temple; while in the later masonry of the time of Justinian, on its south wall, an inscription bearing Hadrian's name has been built in upside down, proving that he placed in the temple his own statue, of which the head has been found cast among the stones of the north road, close to Calvary. After 135 A.D. the Sanhedrin was removed to Galilee, and the Jews prospered under the tolerant Antonine emperors. To this age belong the ruined synagogues with late Hebrew texts; they are mainly remarkable for the representation of animal life in their decoration—showing that even the Rabbis were not strict in following the prohibitions of the Law in that age. The dispersion of the race is shown also by the Jewish catacombs of Rome and Naples, and by the Karaite tombstones in South Russia, which date from

our second century. The degradation of the Jews, when oppressed by the Catholic Church in our fourth and fifth centuries, is also witnessed by numerous magic bowls, with late Hebrew spells written inside, which have been discovered in Chaldea.

Thus, basing our inquiry on monumental evidence alone, we are able to prove the antiquity of Hebrew civilisation, and—in general outline—the genuine character of that history which is to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the later account by Josephus. We see that the wild tribesmen burst into Palestine from Seir in the fifteenth century B.C. That they gradually adopted the civilisation of the Canaanites, which was of Babylonian origin. That they were conquered by Assyria, but had become powerful and rich under Hezekiah. That they worshipped Jehovah, and destroyed the idols of Canaan. That they were finally subdued by Rome, after a short century of independence under the Hasmonean kings; and that they were finally dispersed all over the earth, but not persecuted by the Roman emperors until the triumph of the Catholic Church, which oppressed them till it fell in turn before the sword of Islam. We may turn, therefore, to the question of Hebrew literature, as now affected by a true knowledge of monumental records.

ii. The Bible.—The Hebrew Scriptures represent a literature extending over at least a thousand years. The later Jews divided them into three classes—the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings—in the supposed order of their antiquity; and, roughly speaking, the order appears to be correct.[1]

The Law has always stood alone in Hebrew estima-

[1] (i) The *Torah*, or "Law," is the Pentateuch: (ii) the *Nabaim* or "Prophets" (including the twelve minor prophets counted as one book) comprise eight works: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings being counted as four: (iii) the *Cethubim*, or "writings," include Job,

tion, and the Samaritans when they separated from the Jews,—about 450 B.C.—while they accepted the Pentateuch, took no other part of the Scriptures. Both Jews and Samaritans in later times attributed all the law to Moses, though the Pentateuch contains no declaration that he was its author. We know nothing about him but what is to be found in the Bible; but there is no improbability in a great leader having guided the Hebrews to the desert at the time when the Egyptians were expelling Asiatics, while it was impossible for them to have entered Palestine (strongly held by the Egyptians) till after the revolution which we know to have happened in the fifteenth century B.C. We know also that cuneiform writings were numerous, and tablets commonly used by Canaanites and others, in this age; and there is nothing improbable in the early writing down of simple tribal laws on tablets of stone in the desert. Nor is there any reason why the worship of one national god by the Hebrews should not have been equally ancient, considering that Monotheism of a vague kind already existed in Egypt.

A new light has been cast on this subject by the discovery of the laws of 'Ammurabi, which are more than five hundred years older than any law of Moses could be. A very careful comparison of this code of about two hundred and eighty Babylonian laws with those of the Pentateuch is instructive. 'Ammurabi's laws do not include any Decalogue, or any laying down of general principles. They are all decisions as to special cases, and they represent a highly developed civilisation, and trading conditions quite different from those of the early Hebrew tribes of herdsmen,

the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Daniel, the Book of Chronicles, Ezra Nehemiah, and Esther—nine in all. The total is thus made to coincide with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

and farmers, for whom the Ten Commandments were laid down. There is no evidence of literary borrowing by the Hebrews from these older laws: there is only that similarity of custom which is natural if we suppose that the Hebrews—like the Canaanites—came originally from Haran and Babylonia, and were subject to such kings as 'Ammurabi, who evidently ruled the west, and whose name, and that of Eriaku his contemporary, were very naturally identified by Rawlinson with those of Amraphel and Arioch of Genesis[1]—a view which has never been shown to be incorrect. Out of the two hundred and eighty laws of 'Ammurabi only sixty are the same as those of the Hebrews, and in sixteen other cases the Babylonian law is different from, or even opposite to, the Hebrew. To all the remaining decrees that treat of trade, and of special cases, the Pentateuch contains no parallel at all. The Babylonian punishments are more severe than those of the Hebrews. Stoning was a natural mode of execution in the desert. In Babylon it is replaced by drowning, or impaling. The principle of the "lex talionis"—eye for eye and tooth for tooth—is the same; but as regards slaves the Hebrew law is more merciful, while it is more strict in questions of morals. Both codes command that wizards should be killed, both protect from the goring ox; but the thief in Babylon must restore tenfold instead of fivefold, and sixty stripes are decreed instead of thirty-nine, as among Hebrews. The Babylonian was punished for not restoring a fugitive slave to his master, the Hebrew was bidden later to protect him. The command "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"[2] has no parallel in 'Ammurabi's legislation, nor is it concerned with any religious beliefs, being purely secular, and mostly in favour of the rich and powerful.[3]

[1] Gen. xiv. [2] Lev. xix. 18. [3] See Chap. III. pp. 87–90.

The picture of civilisation in Genesis is one which, as we now know, applies to the age of 'Ammurabi, and which incidentally points to the Babylonian origin of the Hebrews. The position of Hagar and her son is illustrated by 'Ammurabi's laws;[1] and so is Abraham's bargain with the Hittites in presence of witnesses.[2] The presents given to Rebekah's family, and the terms on which Jacob became Laban's herd, are other instances.[3] The stories of Creation, Eden, and the Flood, in Genesis, present—as is well known—remarkable parallels to those found in Assyrian copies of old Akkadian stories. There is no evidence of direct borrowing, nor is it necessary to suppose that these traditions were learned by the Hebrews in the later age of captivity; for not only the Assyrians, but the early Akkadians also, believed in an orderly creation by the god of heaven; and an early Babylonian seal represents a man—or a deity—plucking the fruit of a tree, while behind the female figure that confronts him a serpent rises erect. But the Babylonian legends are part of a purely mythical cycle, and the Hebrew version is distinguished by the absence of any allusion to the polytheistic ideas which characterise all Babylonian religious records. That Babylonian myths were known even in Egypt in the time of Moses has been clearly proved by tablets found at Amarna.

The geography of Genesis, in like manner, represents acquaintance with all parts of Western Asia, and a distinction of three races, which we find monumentally to have been possible in the time of Moses. There is, however, one important indication of somewhat later date to be recognised in the notice of the city

[1] Laws 147 and 170: Gen. xvi. 2, 6, xxi. 10.

[2] Law 10: Gen. xxiii. 16–18.

[3] Law 159: Gen. xxiv. 53. Laws 261, 266: Gen. xxx. 28, xxxi. 39–41.

Rameses[1]: for though Zoan—the Hebrew centre in the Delta—was certainly as old as the time of Jacob, it did not receive the name Pa-Ramessu till the time of Rameses II., or more than two centuries after the probable date of the Exodus. The story of Joseph would thus appear not to have been written till 1300 B.C., at earliest. The notices of Hebrew kings, and the allusions to the Canaanites as a former population, would also (if these are not later glosses) bring down the composition of Genesis to the time of Saul at least.

The collection of distinct episodes in this ancient book suggests that the original documents were a collection of separate tablets afterwards written out as one work. The careful collection of such tablets by the Assyrians in the seventh century B.C. has been described, and the writing out of the Korān also from separate documents. There are reasons for supposing that the original tablets of Genesis were written in cuneiform,[2] and they may have been preserved to a comparatively late age. We do not, of course, know when such tablets were written out on scrolls in alphabetic characters, but it would probably not have been done till the time of Solomon, and may have happened as late as the time of Hezekiah's reformation: for tablets were still in use in the days of Isaiah, and even as late as 600 B.C., while on the other hand scrolls written in ink are noticed in the time of Jeremiah.[3] The same method of compilation may apply to other Hebrew books, and—if we may trust the titles in the Greek version—it appears that some of the older psalms were also transcribed from ancient tablets.

[1] Gen. xlvii. 11; Exod. i. 11; Psalm lxxviii. 12; Num. xiii. 22.

[2] See my volumes, "Bible and the East," 1896, pp. 62–67, "First Bible," 1902, pp. 83–95.

[3] Isa. xxx. 8; Hab. ii. 2; Jer. xxxvi. 23; Prov. xxv. 1.

Many of the oldest laws in the Pentateuch refer to agricultural life, and could not have been needed till Israel had at least settled down in the lands beyond Jordan. The description of the tabernacle, in Exodus, would also seem more probably to represent the semi-permanent structure at Shiloh than the original "tent of meeting" in the desert. But tents with pillars of gold are noticed among the Canaanites by Thothmes III. long before Moses[1]; and the engraving of gems, the use of vestments and incense by priests, the offering of precious vessels and of regular sacrifices in temples, were features of Akkadian religion from the earliest known age. The Hebrews were not the only ancient people who feared defilement by the dead: not only were the Persians and the Hindus in constant dread of such pollution, but the Akkadians also, as early as 2800 B.C. The sacrifice of the first-born, and the letting loose of a scape-goat, or other victim, carrying away the sins of the people, are very early and widespread customs in Asia. The Levirate marriage (or wedding of the brother's widow), like the custom of circumcision, we have seen to be equally general and early. The Hebrew rites connected with the cleansing of the leper recall Akkadian charms. Arks, and altars, and symbolic cherubs, we find very early in both Egypt and Chaldea. The institution of a Sabbath, or day of rest, was also Babylonian, though not connected with a week of seven days, as among the Hebrews. The laws against witchcraft and the eating of blood are said to have been known to Saul, as well as the ancient curse against Amalek. There is nothing in the priestly code of the Pentateuch to suggest a late age, or that does not find very ancient parallels in the customs of surrounding nations even before the time of Moses. The Hebrews are distinguished only by the worship of Jehovah, and by

[1] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," 1879, i. p. 326.

the detestation of idols which was recorded in their oldest tablets—the Ten Commandments. It is not natural to suppose that elaborate ritual would have been regulated during the age of captivity, when the temple was in ruins and the priests were scattered. Nor can we ascribe this ritual properly to the age of Ezra; for the language of the Pentateuch throughout is ancient, and free from the Persian words which appear in books written after the return from captivity. There is, in short, nothing in this ritual that may not have been practised under Solomon and Hezekiah, and the fact that the Law was forgotten does not prove its non-existence, for it was broken equally by the Jews of our second century, as we see by the representation of living forms sculptured on the synagogues of Galilee. The table of races in Genesis makes no mention of the Persians, who were known to the Assyrians in Hezekiah's time, but represents the inhabitants of Elam to be Semitic, which we now know them to have been in early times, as shown by the ancient texts recently found at Susa. The existence of a written law in the eighth century B.C. is clearly declared by a prophet of that age.[1]

The Law is summed up in the impassioned declamations of Deuteronomy—a work which lays down various changes of practice that became necessary when the tribes had spread all over Palestine, to regions remote from the central sanctuary. There are probably few now left who believe that Moses wrote the account of his own death; and it would seem more natural to suppose that the law of the kingdom was laid down after the Hebrews had become subject to a king.[2] All that we really know as to the history of this noble book is to be found in the Book of Kings.

[1] Hosea viii. 12. See 2 Chron. xvii. 9.

[2] Deut. xvii. 14–20, xxxiv. 1–12.

One of its peculiar decisions is said to have been obeyed by a king as early as about 826 B.C.[1] It thus apparently formed part of that ancient "Book of the Law" which was found forgotten in the temple two centuries later.

The oldest known manuscript of any part of the Law is a copy of the Ten Commandments, belonging to a synagogue service of our second century, and quite recently found in Egypt.[2] The oldest dated Hebrew manuscript of importance is that of the Prophets, at St. Petersburg, which goes back only to 916 A.D., though "unpointed" fragments of the Law, and of other parts of the Bible, are no doubt earlier. We are thus unable to study any complete and ancient Hebrew text, or to determine what glosses and corruptions may, in the course of ages, have occurred. That such corruptions, though small, are often very misleading, we see from an actual instance. In one passage of Judges[3] we find, in our present Hebrew text and in the Greek version as well, the words "captivity of the land," which would make the date of the passage not earlier than 720 B.C. But in the St. Petersburg manuscript we find this to read "captivity of the ark," and the context in the next verse shows that this is more probably the true reading. Hence what might be taken as a mark of date disappears as the error of some scribe at a late historic period. This instance should make us very cautious in critical deductions from single words, or sentences, which may have been only the errors, or the intentional alterations, of copyists who were well-meaning, but ignorant or careless.

When, however, we compare the Hebrew text with that of the Greek version, as represented by manu-

[1] 2 Kings xiv. 6; Deut. xxiv. 16: see 2 Kings xxii. 8.

[2] S. A. Cook, in "Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc." January 1903, p. 34 seq.

[3] Judg. xviii. 30; see verse 31.

scripts of our fourth and fifth centuries, or with the Samaritan version, of which the most ancient copy at Shechem may be equally old, we find clear evidence of the jealous care with which the Law was copied and translated, carrying us back to the time of the first translation into Greek, about 250 B.C. There are passages in Exodus, it is true, which are transposed in the Greek, and there are numerous differences of reading which are important to a minute textual study. But substantially it appears that the Pentateuch as now known is the same work that existed in the days of the Ptolemies. The study of Assyrian tablets, and especially of duplicate copies, proves to us the careful and conscientious spirit in which the ancient scribes of civilised Asia treated their original sources. The discrepancies, which were as well known to the early rabbis as they are to modern critics, are also valuable evidence of respect for the text by generations of scribes, who have preserved them even when they could not explain them; and some of these discrepancies are now found to be only apparent, while others seem to be due to variations in the transcription of documents originally written in the indefinite cuneiform character. The respect for ancient writings which was so conspicuous in Babylonia was no doubt equally felt by Hebrew scribes; and it is very improbable that Ezra, who was "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," would have dared to edit or to alter the Scriptures of his race, in face of the twice-repeated command in Deuteronomy (a work admitted by all to have existed centuries before his time)—"thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it."[1] The later Hebrew Scriptures—the Prophets and the Writings—were either badly copied in Greek from imperfect Hebrew manuscripts, or else the Hebrew text itself was less jealously guarded than that of the

[1] Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32.

Law. The variations are in these cases more important, especially in the Books of Samuel and Jeremiah, where additions as well as large omissions occur; and the Egyptian Jews seem to have been often quite unable to understand the meaning of terse expressions and peculiar words in the Book of Job. But the veneration for the Law was so great that even the alteration of a letter was a matter for serious consideration, and we may well believe that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was the work known as the "commandments of Moses" in Solomon's age, when also the original tablets of the Decalogue existed, stored in the ark.[1]

The Pentateuch itself quotes from ancient sources that have perished;[2] and later writers, when using ancient sources, were equally careful to state their authority, whether it were some early Hebrew song, or some official chronicle like those to which the authors of the books of Kings and Chronicles refer as extant in their days. The Book of Joshua was evidently not composed till some five centuries after the conquest, at earliest,[3] and the writer alludes to an ancient couplet on which he bases his belief in a great miracle:

> "Be dark[4] on Gibeon, Sun,
> And Moon in Vale of Ayalun."

The Hebrews were not the only ancient people to suppose that the sun could be made to stand still in heaven at the command of a divinely aided hero, or that the waters of a river should be parted to "leave a dry passage."[5] The Persians, and no doubt the Babylonians—who related equally great miracles—

[1] 2 Chron. viii. 13; 1 Kings viii. 9.

[2] See Num. xxi. 14.

[3] Joshua x. 13; 2 Sam. i. 18; the "Book of Jasher."

[4] Compare the Arabic *damm* and Assyrian *damu*, "to be obscured" or "smeared over," Josh. x. 13.

[5] See Pehlevi Bahman Yasht, iii. 33; Aban Yasht, xix. 78.

held the same belief in wonders with the Hebrews. A miracle was an occurrence of which the cause was not understood in an age of ignorance, but which was manifestly opportune. In many cases we may suppose that natural phenomena were misunderstood, and that tradition magnified the actual facts. The old couplet in the Book of Jasher, if more than a poetic figure, may have referred to an eclipse, and may have been misunderstood;[1] but the belief in miracles was common to all the ancients, and remains common all over the East. Those who have lived in countries where science is unknown will often be able to understand how easily unusual events come to be regarded as special acts of divine interposition, and how the story of the past was always loaded with wonders in popular tradition.

When on the other hand we turn to consider the geography of the Book of Joshua, we see at once that the author had an intimate knowledge of Palestine, and that it could not have been so described by a priest either during or after the Captivity. The fragmentary history in the Book of Judges contains many similar allusions to topography which prove its genuine character, although, in consequence of the connection of his name with that of the sun, the story of Samson appears to have been overgrown with legends like those of the Babylonian Gilgamas and of the Phœnician Melkarth. The chronicle known as the Book of Samuel is free from such marvels, and appears (unless we are again misled by a gloss[2]) to have been composed after the death of Solomon. The

[1] Mr. E. W. Maunder (of Greenwich Observatory) kindly had calculated for me in 1904 that eclipses of the sun were visible at Gibeon in June 1479, September 1476, and August 1464 B.C. The latter was the most important, and was annular at 11.45 a.m. local time. The others were partial eclipses only.

[2] 1 Sam. xxvii. 6, "kings of Judah."

honesty of its account of David's sin, and the vividness of its narrative; the accuracy of its topographical notices, and the archaisms of its style, combine to make it one of the most valuable accounts of Hebrew life in the Bible, belonging to a time of increasing power and civilisation of which we have no record in monuments of other nations, because they had no victories over Israel to record. The Book of Kings, which was completed not earlier than 562 B.C.,[1] though based on official records in part, is a far less spontaneous chronicle, and its account of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, being written three centuries after they lived, contains much that can only have been derived from popular tradition. The most valuable information as to Hebrew beliefs and customs, from the ninth to the fifth centuries B.C., must always be derived from the writings of the Nabaim, or "inspired" men, who maintained the worship of Jehovah among the idolatrous Hebrews.

The Hebrew "Cethubim"—the third class of "writings"—include the beautiful Book of Job, which was perhaps written about 600 B.C., or later. The Psalms were divided into five books, of which the two last include the hymns of exile and of restoration: the third book (especially in the psalms by Asaph and Ethan) refers to the destruction of the temple, the separation of Israel and Judah, and Assyrian attacks on Palestine. These psalms could therefore not be earlier than from 960 to 730 B.C.,[2] and others by Asaph in the second book would also be later than the time of David. Psalms with the title "for David" are indeed sometimes clearly written in his honour, like that which ends "God save the king: hear us when we call."[3] But the recovery of the great psalm of

[1] 2 Kings xxv. 27.

[2] See Psalms lxxiv., lxxix, lxxviii, lxxxii. 8, lxxxix, 38–51.

[3] Psalm xx. 9.

Thothmes III.,[1] and of the Akkadian hymns, shows us that there is no improbability in the Hebrew statements which make David the "sweet singer of Israel," and no one known to us is more likely to have composed the beautiful Psalm xxiii.—"The Lord is my shepherd." The early psalms of the first book are songs of the triumph of Jehovah—"Kiss the ground lest He be angry"—and of victory over the heathen. They speak of a "tabernacle" as well as of a temple, and of mingled trouble and prosperity.[2] The differences of language, style, and subject, between these early psalms and those of the second temple are sufficient evidence of their antiquity.

If Hebrew genius rises to its greatest height in Job, and in some of the psalms, it also shows its most poetic form in the beautiful "Song of Songs for Solomon." It is quite possible that the language of this bridal ode is very ancient,[3] and it compares with early Egyptian love-songs as well as with those of the Arabs. The love of nature, and the passion of the song, together make it one of the most notable works in the Old Testament. Bride and bridegroom —the princess from Lebanon and her royal mate— answer one another in turn; and the ode used to be sung at Passover by choirs of men and women, just as such songs are now sung at weddings in Palestine. The Book of Proverbs contains two collections of the pithy sayings attributed to Solomon; and in the second—which the "men of Hezekiah copied out"— some of these sayings are repeated, while the later

[1] Brugsch, "History of Egypt," 1879, i. pp. 370–373.

[2] Psalm ii. 12, ix. 15, 20, xviii. 43, 50, xxvii. 4, 5.

[3] The two words supposed to show late date are, *Pardes* in iv. 13, for "Paradise" (perhaps a mistake for *Pardath* "seed"), and *Apirion* in iii. 9, for "litter" (as in Syriac), which may be old. Foreign words due to trade may easily be as old as 1000 B.C., and *Egoz* ("nut"), in vi. 11, is not Persian. Aramaisms are no mark of late date, as we learn from the Moabite Stone and the Samala texts.

proverbs of Agur are added, and the beautiful alphabetic poem in honour of the good wife, placed in the mouth of a royal mother. But language alone is sufficient to prove that the "Preacher," though speaking in the name of Solomon, must have lived in the later age of Persian rule; and it is impossible to regard the Book of Esther as very strictly historical, or as being certainly of contemporary date.

The Jews have never reckoned Daniel among the ancient prophets. The book is classed with later works, and it has been considered that the Hebrew chapters were written not earlier than 164 B.C.—by critics who, as early as our third century, noted its detailed description of the history of the Seleucidæ down to the death in Elam of Antiochus IV. These chapters are now separated by a long Aramaic Targum which, on account of its allusions to Rome, might be thought to be yet later.[1] But the Hebrew author had evidently a very good knowledge of Babylonian titles and words as well as of Persian, and the later kings of Assyria really kept caged lions in their park to which prisoners were thrown, while the names of certain musical instruments, though known to the Greeks, were not of Greek origin, but only borrowed words.

The three remaining books once formed a single chronicle, which cannot have been completed before about 330 B.C.[2] This contained not only a priestly history based on the older Scriptures, and on documents which are now lost, but also the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah (which are distinguishable as fragments by the use of the first person singular), with quotations in Aramaic apparently copied from royal decrees written in cuneiform. The latest books

[1] Dan. ii. 4, to vii. 28. This begins at the word *Aramith* "Aramaic." See also Ezra iv. 7, where we read the note: "The letter was in Aramean writing (probably cuneiform), and the Targum is Aramean."

[2] See Neh. xii. 22.

admitted into the Jewish canon thus appear to be compilations from old materials. But the distinction between the narrative of the later scribe and the sources which he quotes is clear, and no attempt is made to represent the work as of more ancient date. The language is that of his own age, and this enables us to show that the Hebrew of Solomon's time was not that of Ezra's day.

The Bible has been severely criticised for nearly two thousand years. It is the fate of all the greatest books in the world to be misunderstood and condemned by later readers; yet they remain as a delight to mankind. Homer has been torn to pieces, but Achilles, Ulysses, and Thersites are still alive: the excavations at Troy became the grave of unscientific criticism; and the papyrus fragments of the Iliad unearthed in Egypt do not tend to confirm the views of Wolf in the eighteenth century. Dante and Shakespeare are also the subjects of study which is often pedantic; and each generation gives a new misinterpretation. But the masters of mankind are immortal. It is the same with the Bible, which has spread all over the world, translated into every human tongue. A sacred literature which is not criticised is usually one not read, or which has become little better than a fetish. But each critic writes at his own peril, and is subject to destruction as knowledge increases. He is gathered to his fathers on the dusty shelf, while the great book still remains unharmed, and becomes better understood.

If we go back to the second century we find that the Jews then denied that the virgin birth of the Messiah was ever mentioned by Isaiah;[1] and Jerome

[1] The word *'Almah* ("young woman" in Hebrew) is rendered "virgin" in the Greek, as it now stands, in Isa. vii. 14. See Justin Martyr, "Trypho," lxvii: Irenæus, "Hæres," III. xxi. 1; Cyril, "Catech. Lect." xii. 31; from 150 to 348 A.D.

tells us that Porphyry, about 250 A.D., denied that the Book of Daniel could be older than the age of Antiochus IV. The Rabbis of the second and fourth centuries A.D., poring over their Scriptures, were often troubled by discrepancies which they dared not emend, and had grave doubts whether the Song of Songs and the Book of Ecclesiastes should be admitted into the canon, and whether Ezekiel's description of the cherubim did not tend to idolatry.[1] In the West, after the Gothic invasion, Greek and Hebrew were unstudied, and Latin gradually became a dead language. The learning of Jerome had supplied an improved Latin version of the Bible in the fourth century, though the Vulgate was not adopted by the Church till about 1000 A.D., and was afterwards corrupted by monkish scribes. When the Bible was unread, because no one knew even Latin enough to read it, criticism naturally slept. But Saxons and Germans, from 700 A.D. downwards, constantly attempted to render parts at least of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue; and when at length printed Bibles appeared the voice of criticism was again heard—a result which the Roman Church always foresaw to be inevitable. Grotius[2] in the seventeenth century wrote on the truth of Christianity, but he condemned the Song of Solomon, like many of his predecessors, and considered that Ecclesiastes was written after the return from captivity. A century later the Bible was attacked by Voltaire, who was well acquainted with criticisms which are often supposed to be quite recent discoveries. Voltaire was the foe of the superstition and priestcraft of an age of tyranny, but he tells us that he accepted Christ as his only Master. He had, however, a deep prejudice against the Jews, and he imagined that the Hebrews, before the Persian age,

[1] Mishnah, *Yadaim*, iii. 5; Tal. Bab. *Sabbath*, 13, *b*.

[2] Grotius, "De Veritate Religionis Christianæ," 1636.

were only ignorant bandits without either laws or letters.[1] He quotes with approbation the criticism of David's sins published by Bayle in 1696; he says—quite wrongly—that the Jews themselves stated the Pentateuch not to have been known till the time of king Josiah, and believes that Deuteronomy must have been written late. He tells us that Newton and Leclerc believed the Pentateuch to be the work of Samuel, "when the Jews had a little knowledge of reading and writing; and that all these histories are imitations of Syrian fables." He anticipates the numerical difficulties of Colenso; he was well acquainted with the ideas of Astruc, and with the absurd theory of Jacobi (published in 1771) about the Song of Songs, which was derived from observations by Ibn Ezra in our twelfth century, and has since been elaborated by Renan, Ewald, and Delitzsch, but which showed an entire want of acquaintance with Hebrew customs, substituting an European drama for a Semitic bridal ode.

Jean Astruc was a well-known French physician, the son of a converted Protestant minister, and born at Sauve, in Languedoc, on March 19, 1684. His famous "Conjectures" on the Pentateuch,[2] published at Paris in 1753, were hurriedly withdrawn six years later, as likely to compromise Silhouette, the son-in-law of Astruc, when about to be made Contrôleur Général by Louis XV. All copies of the work that could be found were burnt by the author, and it is therefore now very rare. Astruc was the first to see that the various episodes in Genesis can be distinguished by the use of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah; but he assumed (consciously or not) that these should be taken as given in the modern Hebrew text. Any

[1] "Dictionnaire Philosophique," published 1764.

[2] Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux dont il paraît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse, 1753.

theorist who now desired to elaborate a new view might obtain quite different results by following the Greek of the Septuagint; for there is perhaps no point in which the Hebrew and Greek of Genesis differ more often than in the use of these words. We see, therefore, that modern criticism of the Old Testament first arose among those who formed, with Diderot and others, the party of the Encyclopédie, which was then (1751 to 1765) just beginning to appear. French criticism was adopted later by the German universities, but it originated with Voltaire and Astruc as disciples of Bayle.

Astruc's theory was adopted by Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, the learned professor of Oriental languages at Göttingen, in 1787;[1] and about the same time Gesenius, at Halle, was advocating critical views, such as the distinction of a second author in the Book of Isaiah. Both scholars possessed a really profound knowledge of text and language, but it is instructive to read the work of Eichhorn—now so obsolete—since we see that a tendency to dogmatise on very doubtful premises is accompanied by that entire ignorance of Eastern antiquities which was inevitable in his days. He admits that Asia is "little known to us," and thinks that the "entire literature" of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Babylon had perished. He speaks of the "general reading of the people," and of a Hebrew "popular text-book," being apparently unaware that only a very special class of scribes could then read or write at all. The determination of date and authorship he makes to depend on the "finest operations of the higher criticism." Many of these errors survive in the criticism of to-day, and the presumption of the first critics—a century and a half ago—is still to be marked in the tone of academic assertions. Eichhorn knew nothing of archæology as now studied. He

[1] "Einleitung in das Alte Testament," 1787.

thought that the oldest documents must have been scrolls of linen or of skins: "For all other writing materials besides these were either unknown to the old world, or of use only in other lands too remote from Palestine." Thus he ignores all the allusions to tablets of clay and of stone which are to be found in the Old Testament. He doubts whether Moses wrote in square Hebrew, or in an alphabet like that of the Jewish coins of the second century B.C., which were the oldest characters then known. He says that Jerome "imagined" the letter *Tau* to have had the shape of a cross among the Samaritans. But Jerome knew the fact, and Eichhorn did not. He asserts that the ancients wrote without any division between words, whereas the Moabite Stone, and the Siloam Inscription, divide each word from the next by dots.

The older critical school supposed the Pentateuch to consist of four or five documents by different authors, and claimed that these could be easily distinguished. But a deeper examination showed connections that were at first overlooked, and the clash of opinions gradually led to the abandonment of Astruc's criterion, and to the supposition that the ancient fragments incorporated by a later compiler could not always be separated with certainty. The idea that the supposed marks of date, and discrepancies, might be due to small glosses and alterations by generations of scribes down to the seventh century A.D., does not seem to have suggested itself to the advocates of a theory of "editing" which is quite contrary to anything that we know of the habits of the more ancient copyists, in the times when documents were of a more durable nature than later parchment scrolls. An instance has been already given where a false theory of date has been founded on the blunder of a copyist, writing after the establish-

ment of a standard text by the Rabbis of Palestine whom Jerome consulted.

Even the more recent schools of criticism have failed to appreciate the revolution that has been brought about by antiquarian discoveries in the East. They repeat the old theories of a prescientific age, and they are often misled by taking their information second-hand from popular works on archæology. The criticism of the last century and a half has naturally suffered from several disabilities. In the first place, there are no ancient manuscripts, or other documents, known to exist to guide the student of the text. Hence there is no curb that can be placed on speculation as to the original reading. In the second place, the critical writers have, as a rule, had no personal acquaintance with Eastern life. In the third, they have had no special knowledge of modern archæology, or of the reading of Egyptian and cuneiform texts; and finally, they have been unable to escape from the atmosphere of prejudice and suspicion which was created by the ignorance of the French school, who always attributed to the Hebrew writers the same vices, of motive, and of priestcraft, which influenced the corrupt Church against which they fought. Future criticism, while accepting fully the results of actual discovery, is likely to be far less dogmatic, and far more sympathetic. At its best criticism is, at present, speculative, and has no claim to be regarded as truly scientific; while at its worst it has become pedantic, and appeals to authority and reputation rather than to logical argument.

But we do not read the Bible with the object of picking holes in it, or of discrediting its claims to our affection and admiration. The truths that it proclaims are so simple that the least learned can understand all that is most worth learning from its pages. It is not a book for specialists or for priests, but one which

appeals throughout to the human heart and understanding.

It matters little to us now who were the actual authors. We are not interested in the exact dates, or in the petty wars of the kings of Israel and Judah; but only in the ruin which the Hebrews suffered because they would not listen to their great teachers. We have ceased to care about the sacrifices, and are only appreciative of the higher teaching of prophets and psalmists who held sacrifice to be vain. The Hebrews had a gift of vivid and simple narrative which is not equalled by even the best Babylonian literature; and Genesis will always remain a fascinating picture of early Eastern life; while the beautiful story of Joseph would suffice by itself to make the Book immortal, as would the narrative of Samuel's childhood, or the simple idyll of Ruth. The story of the Shunamite mother, in Kings, might be a description of peasant life in the Palestine of to-day. The Psalms have perhaps had more power over human hearts than anything that was ever written by man. The Book of Job teaches us the humble trust in Providence which distinguished the Hebrew: and the "Preacher," who commends to us the simple joys of home, and exhorts us to remember God in the days of our youth, was not the weary worldling that those who suppress his moral would have us suppose. It is for the sake of these things that men read the English Bible.

The Bible teaching as to God, the soul, the resurrection, and the Messiah, requires to be studied in the Old Testament if we are to understand what the Jews believed in the time of our Lord. We may well suppose that to the average Hebrew, before the Captivity, Jehovah was little more than the national Baal —a sun god adored with the image of a calf. But it is with the belief of the great prophets who denounced an idolatrous nation that we are really

concerned; and we look in vain to either Egypt, or Babylonia, for Monotheism like that of the Decalogue and of the poetic books of the Old Testament. The command, "Thou shalt have no other god before Me," develops into the definite declaration that there is no other God: "for there is no saviour beside Me." "There is none else, no god beside Me." "I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil."[1] "Shall there be evil in a city and Jehovah hath not done it?" "Whom Jehovah loveth He correcteth." "Jehovah hath made all for Himself, yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of Jehovah."[2] "The fear of Adonai, that is Wisdom." "The Almighty, we cannot find Him out"; "such knowledge is too wonderful for me"; yet—"Like as a father pitieth his children, so Jehovah pitieth them that fear Him."[3]

In the days of Saul and of Ahab the evil spirit was said to have been sent by God as well as the good spirit; and when, in later times, the name of the Satan or "enemy." appears,[4] it is as a recording angel that he enters the council on high, to report of Job that he is "naked to the skin—yet all that a man hath will he give for his life." The mediæval devil was not the Satan of the Bible. He was the Norse Loki, the mischievous god of "fire," and of hell, the Slav Zernebog or "black god," who was the Persian Angromainyus or "angry mind." Europe in the dark ages lived in fear of an arch fiend whom the later Gnostics had identified with Jehovah. But such superstition, though found also among the Jews when infected by

[1] Hos. xiii. 4; Isa. xlv. 5–7.

[2] Amos iii. 6; Isa. xlv. 7; Prov. iii. 12, xvi. 4, 33.

[3] Job xxviii. 28, xxxvii. 23; Psalm cxxxix. 6, ciii. 13.

[4] 1 Sam. xviii. 10; 1 Kings xxii. 21; Zech. iii. 1; Job ii. 4; 1 Chron. xxi. 1.

Babylonian sorcery, is not the teaching of the great writers of Israel.

The Hebrews, like all their contemporaries, believed in a Hades which was a land of shades—a Sheol or "hollow place," which was not a place of torment save for the wicked who were judged under the ocean: "for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched" "Small and great are there"; but "there the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary are at rest." To Sheol the powerful must descend as Rephaim or ghosts—"all the he goats on earth"—and ancient heroes sleep, as "they have laid their swords under their heads": for death and Sheol are insatiable.[1] But even in Isaiah the idea of immortality also appears, and Job's despair gradually gives place to hope. "For there is hope of a tree that is pruned . . . through the smell of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs as a plant. . . . If a strong man die shall he live? All my allotted days will I wait till my change come." "I know my champion is living, and will stand up hereafter over the dust; and this after they have destroyed my body; also from my flesh I shall gaze on God." But the wicked is not "gathered"; he is blown away by the tempest (as the Persians taught), while the righteous "shall be satisfied," beholding God's face.[2]

According to the ancient belief each soul was judged when it died, and the expectation of a future judgment day is found only after the Hebrews came in contact with the Persians. The ancient belief in the "branch" of the house of David, and in the prophet to come in future, also changed gradually, under the same in-

[1] Gen. xxxvii. 35; Num. xvi. 30; Job xxvi. 5, 6, xxxvi. 30–31; Isa. lxvi. 24; Job iii. 17; Isa. v. 14, xiv. 9–11; Ezek. xxxii. 18–31; Hab. ii. 5.

[2] Isa. xxvi. 19; Job xiv. 7–15, xix. 26, xxvii. 19; Psalm i. 4, xvii. 15; Dan. xii. 2; Joel iii. 2–14.

fluence, into the expectation of the mysterious Messiah or "anointed one." The Prince Messiah was cut off when the Idumæan Antipater usurped the power of the Hasmonean priest-king; but Israel did not cease to hope for the coming of a Son of Man with the clouds of heaven, and for a future kingdom of God after a time of trouble.[1]

iii. Later Books.—The Jews considered that their inspired books ceased with the last prophets in the time of Ezra; and though, when they fixed the canon of Scripture at Tiberias after the fall of Bether in 135 A.D., they admitted some works that were considerably later, they excluded many others (written in Aramaic or in Greek) which belong to the Greek and Herodian ages. Some of these, however, are of high importance to an understanding of Jewish thought and history about the Christian Era.

Hebrew philosophy may be said to begin with the Book of Job; and the beautiful passage in which Wisdom is personified was the germ of a large literature. The problem of evil is solved in this noble work by resignation to God's will. Neither Job nor any of his friends can understand his chastisement, nor does Jehovah reveal the reason; but we are asked whether He whose Providence extends to the hinds of the desert and the ravens; whose power controls the mightiest beasts dreaded by man, and created the stars of old, will without reason afflict an humble servant, or unjustly smite the innocent. God is silent: and it is man who boasts and babbles in vain. When, however, we turn to the Book of Wisdom, which was written perhaps in the second century B.C., we see that a work so deeply influenced by Persian and Greek

[1] Isa. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12; Isa. xlv. 1; Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5; Dan. ix. 26 (giving probably a date 47 B.C.); Dan. vii. 13.

philosophy was not likely to have been included in the Canon of Palestine, but belongs rather to the school of Philo. Even the earlier work of Jesus Ben Sira (perhaps written in 210 B.C.), while imitating Job in the personification of Wisdom, includes a peculiar doctrine of creation "in general" which suggests the "ideas" of Plato.[1] It is still a subject of dispute whether the Hebrew original of Ecclesiasticus has been recovered; but, even if written in Hebrew, such a doctrine is foreign, and recalls the Persian belief in prototypes which we also find in India.

In the Book of Wisdom we find adopted the Persian dualism[2]—though not very consistently—and the Persian belief in the immortality of the just (who are called "sons of God" after the old Babylonian manner) is contrasted with Greek scepticism.[3] "Their going from us is a disaster; but they are at peace." The idea of probation, whereby they are "soon perfected,"[4] recalls at once Buddhist philosophy and that of the Republic; but the fate of the wicked is to be blown away by the tempest—an ancient Persian idea. The doctrine of the soul imprisoned in a corruptible body, and that of the Spirit of God "in all," remind us of Plato; but the writer's claim to have studied "the power of spirits" takes us back to Akkadian magic.[5] Like Philo, he allegorises the Old Testament, and introduces the idea of "types" which still survives. But he rises to the noble thought that true Wisdom is Love.[6]

Another work which is yet more deeply influenced by Persian ideas is the Book of Enoch, which was probably compiled as early as the time of Herod the Great. The introductory chapters, and the first vision, include accounts of natural phenomena, of the war in

[1] Ecclus. i. 5, xxiv. 3, xviii. 1.
[2] Wisdom i. 13, ii. 24, xviii. 16.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 1–24, iii. 2, 3.
[4] Wisdom iv. 5, 13, 16, v. 23, viii. 20.
[5] *Ibid.* ix. 15, xii. 1, vii. 20.
[6] *Ibid.* xviii. 24, i. 6, vi. 17, 18.

heaven, of guardian genii, and of a sacred tree, which find their counterparts in the Bundahish.[1] The Messianic belief in a "Son of Man"—concealed and to come in the last days—may be founded on Daniel, but closely resembles Persian expectations as to Sosiosh.[2] The statement that the longest day is double the length of the shortest night seems to be directly borrowed from the Bundahish[3]; and Satan[4] is no longer the recording angel but the evil god of the Persians. To the same age belong some of the Sibylline Oracles, the Psalms of Solomon, and other works, in which the Messianic conceptions of various schools are elaborated.[5] The vision of Esdras, though perhaps touched up by a Christian copyist, apparently represents Jewish belief about 100 A.D. This work also is throughout clearly influenced by Persian expectations as to the future, and by Persian ideas of science. Though worthless as history it has influenced Christian thought more than might be supposed; and the legend of the ten tribes, with the dogma of the fall, are perhaps first traceable in its pages.[6] Another work which is influenced by Persia is the legend of of Tobit; and Asmodeus (the Ashmedai of the Talmud) is the Persian Aeshma-deva or "demon of wrath."[7] This introduction of foreign ideas, which distinguishes Hebrew literature during the Persian and Greek ages, is equally notable in the writings of the Pharisees and of Philo. The Sadducee was the orthodox Jew, whose beliefs were founded on the Law and Prophets; but the Pharisee's imagination was powerfully excited by Persian mythology; while the

[1] Enoch i.–xxxvi.
[2] *Ibid.* xlv.–xlix.
[3] *Ibid.* lxxii. 14; Bundahish, xxv. 4.
[4] *Ibid.* liv. 6, xl. 7.
[5] See Drummond, "Jewish Messiah," 1877.
[6] 2 Esdras iii. 21, xiii. 40.
[7] Tobit iii. 17; Tal. Bab., *Gittin*, 68, *a*, *b*.

philosophic Jews of Egypt are represented by Philo, who sought to reconcile the Hebrew personification of Wisdom with the Greek Logos. Thus, in our second century, we find Judaism developing in two directions, as well as crystallising into Rabbinical formalism which presents an exact parallel to that of the later Persian priests. In Palestine the severity of the Law is tempered by Pharisaic belief in immortality, and the vast wilderness of the Talmud preserves superstitions which revert to the old Babylonian magic, though noble thoughts and tender sayings shine here and there as gems amid the rubbish heaps of corruption. In Egypt, on the other hand, Judaism becomes broader and more philosophic, developing the school which Maimonides represented in our thirteenth century, and which culminates in the Theism of Spinoza.

The Mishnah, or "Second Law," was the last Hebrew book—compiled by the Rabbis of Tiberias in our second century.[1] It came to be regarded two centuries later as an inspired work, but its original intention was to "make a hedge about the Torah." Its language is full of Greek and Latin words, which show us that the Jews were not only living under Roman governors, and influenced by foreign law, science, and medicine, but were also trading with Gentiles, and observing their Law under great difficulties, surrounded as they were by Paganism, both Syrian and Greek. Their detestation of Greek philosophy was especially roused by the Epicurean sceptics.[2] Many strange superstitions were creeping in; and the egg of a locust, the tooth of a fox, or the nail of one crucified, were used as charms[3]; but on

[1] See the edition of Surenhuse in 3 vols. folio, Hebrew and Latin, with the commentaries of Maimonides and Bartenora, 1698.

[2] *Sanhedrin*, xi. 1; *Beracoth*, ix. 5.

[3] *Sabbath*, vi. 10.

the other hand many noble words are preserved in the "Sayings of the Fathers." The Hebrew still spoke of his "Father in heaven"; and Antigonus of Socho (about 270 B.C.) was remembered still as having said, "Be not as servants who serve their master for sake of reward." Rabbi Jose said, "Let thy house be wide open, and let the poor be thy children." The great Hillel commanded the Jews to "love mankind"; and Rabbi Tarphon, the antagonist of Justin Martyr (about 135 A.D.), warned them that "the day is short; the labour vast; but the labourers slothful: the reward is great, and the Master of the House presses for despatch."[1]

The Mishnah was commented on at Jerusalem in the fourth century, and at Babylon later.[2] The Babylonian Talmud, especially, is remarkable for the strange superstitions which infected Judaism under the influence of the ancient animistic beliefs of surrounding nations. It is true that much of the ancient spirit of gentle piety still survived among Jews who were becoming degraded by oppression. The petitions of the Lord's Prayer find their counterpart in this Aramaic commentary on the Mishnah[3]—"Pardon and redeem us, and take us out of trouble"; "Thy will be done in heaven above": these are the petitions of the Jews to their "Father who is in heaven." But side by side with these we find the old Persian beliefs: the soul sits on the grave for a month after death[4]; the doctrine of transmigration is taught[5]; legends are borrowed and applied to Hebrew heroes; Samson's stride recalls that of Vishnu; Adam is bisexual, like the Persian first being.[6] The terrible

[1] Sotah, viii. 15; Pirke Aboth, i. 3, 5, 12, ii. 15.
[2] "Talmud de Babylone," *Chiarini*, 1831.
[3] Ibid. *Beracoth*, 29, *a*, *b*, 35, *b*.
[4] Founded on Job xiv. 22.
[5] Tal. Bab., *Baba Kama*, 16, *a*; *Sanhedrin*, 67, *b*.
[6] Ibid. *Sotah*, 9, *b*; *Erubin*, 18, *a*; *Yebamoth*, 63, *a*.

Lilith, who devours infants, is the Babylonian *Lilitu*—a word derived from the Akkadian *lil*, "ghost." The Jew must bury his nail-parings just like the Persian, lest they should be used to harm him by witches.[1] The ubiquity and malignity of demons is a subject of constant discussion. They are winged, and listen behind the veil to the secrets of heaven; they eat, drink, and are born and die like men. The ashes of a black cat rubbed on the eyes make them visible. They have the claws of birds like Akkadian devils.[2] The old superstition of the evil eye is credited[3]; and the dead are supposed conscious of all that the living do, and may be heard talking in their graves, whence they issue if not buried in matting.[4] The Rabbis fly to heaven by aid of the power they possess as knowing the Name of God.[5] Many Aryan legends are adopted, and fables of Æsop appear in Jewish garb—the old and young wife, the fox and the wolf, the ring swallowed by a fish, and the fox's advice to the fishes, are among them. It is difficult to believe that such literature belongs to the same people who produced Judah Halevi, the poet and pilgrim of the eleventh century, and Spinoza, the disciple of Maimonides in the seventeenth—the humble optician cast out of the synagogue, whose thought still influences Europe, but whose God is the God of the Book of Wisdom, of Philo, and of Paul. In studying the religion of any race we must remember the highest ideals attained as well as the lowest depths to which it may sink. To us the faith of the Hebrews is of primary importance, because on it is founded the faith of Christendom.

[1] Tal. Bab., *Moed Katon*, 18, *a*.
[2] Ibid. *Hagiga*, 16, *a*; *Beracoth*, 6, *a*.
[3] Ibid. *Beracoth*, 35, *b*. [4] Ibid. 18, *b*. [5] Ibid. 51, *a*.

CHAPTER VI

HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

i. Original.—Simplicity is the seal of truth; and Christianity is the simplest of faiths. It teaches us trust in Providence, and good-will to men. Philosophers from Cicero to Herbert Spencer have grumbled because the rain fell into the sea and not on the desert, and because certain animals feed on others. "Love your enemies" is a hard saying to ignorant and half-savage man, though Buddha also said that hate is not overcome by hate but only by love. Yet all that is best in the progress of the world has been due to true Christianity.

But the history of Christianity closely resembles that of Buddhism, and after two centuries of growth long ages of corruption followed. What is called "development" is often only reversion to old superstition. The brilliant hues of the sunset are more splendid than the pure light of noonday; but they herald the night that is to follow. Christianity, however, has shown a power of re-formation, and expansion, in accord with the increase of true knowledge, which Buddhism has not shown itself to possess. The teaching of Jesus was not an esoteric philosophy for the few, but a religion that appealed to the simplest and the wisest alike. In the south of Palestine, among the "Jews" or Judeans, the creed of priests and rulers was symbolised by the huge half-Greek fane at Jerusalem, with its sacrifices and tithes,

its anointed pontiff, and sacred caste of Levites. But Christianity rose from the deep lake among barren crags in the north, and its voice was like the croon of the doves in the oak woods of Galilee. Its first apostles were humble fishermen who—as the Gospels tell us—were unable to understand even the simplest parables till explained to them. "There standeth one among you whom ye know not"[1] was as true when spoken by the Baptist as it still is. When Jesus said "the damsel is not dead but sleepeth," they laughed Him to scorn.[2] He forbade them to announce that He was the Messiah, yet they continued to believe that He would become a king, and carried Him to the temple in triumph. He laid down His life for His friends saying, "My kingdom is not of this age." They believed that the day of triumph had come, though He told them that all would forsake Him on the morrow. They expected that He would be accepted by all, though He said that His teaching would grow as the tree grows from a seed, and that it would be like the corn, with tares among it, to the end. Most of our difficulties are created by the greatness of the Master not being truly understood by those who loved Him as their friend. He foresaw that His teaching must bring "not peace, but a sword," because it was to "overcome evil with good." When we analyse that teaching we find it to be expressed in not more than eighty parables, short sayings, and poetic symbols. Yet these have sunk into men's hearts till they have overcome the world. Many were not new—for the good householder brings forth "things new and old"—and the golden rule, the narrow path, the Father in heaven, were known to Hillel before our Lord was born. But a faith fit for all mankind could not spring from the limitations of the Law as understood at Jerusalem. The mother

[1] John i. 26. [2] Mark v. 39.

of Jesus was the cousin of a priest's wife; and His knowledge of Hebrew, and of the Scriptures, can only have been gained by lessons of which we have no record. But in the mountain home of the north He learned the spirit of the ancient Law, unfettered by the "traditions of men" that made it of no effect. He did not command men to break with their religion, or to rebel against Cæsar; but to those who heard the word, and forgot the law of love, He said, as He says now: "Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" "If ye love Me, keep My commandments."[1]

The first witness of Christianity, the first missionary to spread the law of love beyond the narrow borders of Palestine, the first to preach it among the Gentiles, was Paul of Tarsus. He was brought up as a Pharisee; but there were many schools among that sect, and Paul was educated by the most enlightened and liberal of Rabbis—Gamaliel, the son of Simeon and grandson of Hillel. Tarsus was a centre of Greek philosophy, and a school of rhetoric; but it was not likely that a youth destined to be a Rabbi would have been much influenced by the teaching of its academy. Gamaliel knew Greek,[2] and is even said to have bathed in the "bath of Aphrodite" at Accho; while he admitted an Ammonite into the congregation.[3] He belonged to that philosophic school to which Philo in Egypt was an authority, and to which Josephus the Jewish historian also belonged later—the school which sought to reconcile Judaism with Plato, to allegorise the ancient stories of the Hebrew Scriptures (as Paul often does), and to identify the Greek Logos with the Hebrew Wisdom, which, as the Word of God, created

[1] Luke vi. 46; John xiv. 15.

[2] Renan, "Les Apôtres," 1883, pp. 165, 172. Mishnah, *Beracoth*, ii. 6. Gamaliel uses the Greek word *asthenēs*.

[3] Mishnah, *Abodah Zara*, iii. 5; *Ketuboth*, iv. 3.

all things. The Rabbinical rhetoric of many passages in Paul's Epistles can only be understood aright through acquaintance with such Jewish philosophy; and Paul was never able to regard the first apostles as his equals. The man brought up among rulers of his nation, and educated thinkers, could not but perceive that the poor fishermen of Galilee, who could neither read nor write, were unable to understand their Master, though they had heard His words, and Paul had never known Him while on earth.

Paul tells us that it was not from them, nor from any man, that his belief in Jesus was taken.[1] It was his own vision when he fell in the dust on the weary road to Damascus, and heard the gentle voice that asked, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" it was his trance when he found himself carried to heaven, that convinced him of his blindness; and henceforth he believed in Jesus as the incarnation of divine Wisdom, such as he had learned to expect from his teachers, who were not believers in the popular idea of a King Messiah. He believed, too, that such visions had been seen by Cephas and others before him.[2] But he says nothing of the open tomb, of the miraculous birth, or of the Temptation, Transfiguration, and Ascension. He never mentions the mother of Jesus by name, but says only that He was descended from David. He tells us nothing of our Lord's life save that He instituted the memorial supper, that He was betrayed and crucified, and that He "was declared Son of God by resurrection."[3] What he meant by the Resurrection was not what most Rabbis taught. Like his Master, he said that the future life was one in spiritual bodies, and he repeated the old simile of the corn growing from the

[1] Gal. i. 11–24, ii. 1–16.
[2] 1 Cor. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.
[3] 1 Cor. xi. 23–26; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3, 4.

seed: "For there is a physical body, and there is a spirit body." "But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him." The Anastasis, or "standing up" of the soul, free from the material body, was to Paul and to Philo the Resurrection, as it was also to Plato.[1]

Paul uses the title "Son of God" in the true and ancient Semitic sense, known—as we have seen—even to the Babylonians, and not in the sense it had among Greeks and Romans in his own time and long before. All true believers are "children of God," but especially Jesus as the "perfect man." He speaks often of "the God and Father of Christ,"[2] who is the Father also of all His servants who, "though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God": "by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous": "obedient to death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him."[3]

But though Paul taught the duties of Christians to be those commanded by Jesus; though he speaks of the "meekness and gentleness of Christ," and contrasts "the simplicity that is in Christ" with the limitations of "another gospel," yet the education which made him the founder of Christian philosophy never quite allowed him to reach that true simplicity which we find in the Epistle ascribed to James the Lord's brother. "Pure religion and undefiled before the God and Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; to keep himself unspotted from the world. My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus, the Christ of glory, with respect of persons."[4] Nevertheless, without Paul

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 35–57. See Matt. xxii. 30.

[2] The Logos was "the anointed one," according to Philo.

[3] Gal. iv. 5–7; Ephes. iv. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8–11, 15.

[4] 2 Cor. x. 1, xi. 3; James i. 27, ii. 1.

Christianity would perhaps not have become the universal faith of the West; and it would never have been known to us fully in its original form but for his writings. He disappears from our ken at Rome shortly before the great fire of 64 A.D., and may have perished in Nero's cruel persecution of Jews which followed immediately after. His epistles represent not more than one treatise for each year of his career, and no doubt there was much oral teaching of the little Churches that he founded in Asia Minor and Greece. But the general expectation of the immediate end of the world, among the Hebrews, rendered the Christians indifferent to any other thought than that of the return of the beloved Master whom they saw so often in vision.

Six years after their first persecution, within the lifetime of the first generation, the end actually came. It was not the end that they expected; but it was none the less the beginning of a new world, for them and for others, in Palestine and in Italy. When the great temple fell amid blood and flames, and Rome under Titus stamped out the last resistance to its suzerainty in 70 A.D., all those preoccupations as to Christian relations with Hebrew ritual, and as to the authority of the Law, which filled the mind of Paul and of the unknown author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ceased to be of present importance. There were no more sacrifices or purifications possible; no more priests or Levites; no barrier of caste to separate Christian Jew and Gentile. The broader conceptions of Paul gained way against the strictly Hebrew faith of Peter and James; and the Palestine school shrank into the little Ebionite sect of Bashan, while the Christianity of Paul spread far and wide in the West.

Our difficulties as to the Gospels seem to be due to four main causes. The first disciples themselves

did not fully understand their Master. Their memories of His short life were handed down orally, and the necessity of written records did not become apparent till the first generation began to die out before the coming of the end. The traditions which we possess as to the date and authorship of those four oldest gospels which were accepted, by all the Churches, from among many that have been allowed to perish, are mostly late second-hand statements; and the text of the Christian Fathers of the second century has been so much corrupted, by later scribes, that we can feel little confidence in any particular statement. Finally, we have a fourth difficulty in the lateness of extant manuscripts. A fragment of the first gospel has been found in Egypt which may be as old as the second century; but all the complete (or nearly complete) Greek manuscripts are later than the time of the establishment of the Church by Constantine, and they prove that small, but significant, alterations in the text had already been made, and that others were also made in and after the fourth century.

It appears to have been believed in the second century that Matthew, who was the only one among the apostles likely to have been able to write, had written a gospel in Hebrew, or in Aramaic, which was translated later into Greek.[1] This document has not been recovered. The Hebrew Matthew is said to have been used by the Ebionite Christians of Bashan down to the fourth century; and Jerome tells us that he translated the "Gospel of the Hebrews"; but whether this was the Hebrew Matthew, which Irenæus[2] said that the Ebionites used, is extremely doubtful. We have only the Greek gospels; and it was natural that writers who appealed to the Roman

[1] Irenæus, "Against Heresies," III. i. (a passage much corrupted); Origen, "Against Celsus," v. 61; Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles." iii. 27, vi. 17.

[2] Irenæus, "Against Heresies," I. xxvi.

world should write in Greek. Josephus wrote first in Aramaic, but his later history of "Antiquities" was in Greek, and Greek was also well understood among many of the Jews even in Palestine.

The main authority followed by Eusebius as to the age and authorship of the four gospels, was Papias, who had talked with those who knew the apostles. But Eusebius himself is a very unreliable author, and he appears to have had a poor opinion of Papias, though the latter said that he depended more on what he learned orally about the apostles, John the Elder, and Aristion, than on any books. He said that Matthew's gospel was translated, and that Mark was "the interpreter of Peter" (writing after Peter's death); but whether he referred to the first and second gospels as now extant we have of course no means of knowing.[1] Criticism of the gospels began in the second century, and many apologetic passages occur in the writings of the Fathers.[2] The discrepancies between the four great gospels (which are given their present names in the Canon of Muratori about 180 A.D.) were known and written about yet earlier. They are not matters of primary importance, for in all four we see (perhaps dimly) the same great and loving figure, and if there were no variations of the account there would be only one gospel. The Christians of the second century collected all they considered genuine, and rejected the corrupted gospels of the Gnostics. They thought like Chaucer:

> "As thus: ye wot that every Evangelist
> That telleth us the pain of Jesu Christ
> Ne saith not all thing as his fellow doth
> But not the less their sentence is all sooth."[3]

[1] See quotations by Renan, "L'Église Chrétienne," pp. 125–35.

[2] Irenæus, "Against Heresies," III. i. 1, xi. 8; Eusebius, *H.E.* II. xv., VI. xiv., III. xxiv.

[3] Chaucer, "Sir Thopas," 2133–2136, the spelling being modernised.

Modern criticism can appeal only to internal evidence, comparison, and the study of late manuscripts. It must therefore be speculative at best. It is not likely that the return of Christ within the lifetime of the first generation would have been insisted on if all that generation had died,[1] but, on the other hand, the author of the fourth gospel, though appealing to the evidence of an eye-witness—apparently the beloved disciple—must have written after the death of John, unless we are misled by a later gloss.[2] The apostles were unlettered men, forced to employ scribes, like the majority of the nation. Their Master, though He read Hebrew, never wrote down His sayings; and the memories of the Galilean fishers—who were not likely to know anything of Greek or of Jewish philosophy—were preserved by converts of the second generation. The general opinion appears now to be that the oldest extant gospel is that of Mark, beginning with the Baptism of Jesus. The first and third gospels repeat nearly all that is found in the second. They also have in common fourteen sayings of Jesus, in addition to ten which are in Mark; but as a rule they differ from one another when they are not founded on the older gospel. All three of these gospels are of one class—representing Hebrew beliefs as to Jesus which had developed during half a century or more after His death; but the fourth gospel belongs to a distinct literature, and develops the Pauline philosophy concerning the Word. Yet it breathes also the true spirit when it tells us of the words of Jesus. It contains no parables, yet its similes have become equally dear. Jesus is the Light of the World, the Door, the Vine, the Bread from Heaven, the good Shepherd; and His new commandment is Love—for "God is Love"—while His care for His mother, when

[1] Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 30; Luke xxi. 32.

[2] John xix. 35, xx. 3, xxi. 23–25.

hanging on the Cross, has perhaps done more for Christianity—as recorded in the fourth gospel—than any parable even, or doctrine. The writer was acquainted with Hebrew, and he had an original knowledge of Palestine geography.[1] It is not to be concluded that he was not a Hebrew because he speaks of the "Judeans," whom he distinguishes from the Galileans, and whom he condemns. Much of what we most care for in Christianity would have been lost if the early Church had cast aside the Gospel and Epistles "after John." But we cannot suppose that the author of these books was the same John whose rugged Greek is found in that Apocalypse which won its way with such difficulty into the Christian canon, and which (like others noticed already) is based—even to its smallest details—on the Persian beliefs as to the end of the world. If the one writer has added grace and sweetness to the Christian character, the other has been responsible for most of the misery that has been caused by blind belief and mystic exaltation.

When we turn to consider the question of text, which is so important to the study of the gospels, we find that Celsus was not altogether wrong in saying that the Christians had altered them. The three great "uncial" manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries (the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian) are themselves at variance, and on the other hand agree in excluding many of those "harmonising" alterations which crept in later. Most of the discrepancies are of very small importance; but some are significant. The Sinaitic manuscript was the work of a very ignorant scribe. He knew no Hebrew, or he would not have written *Talitha cum* for *Talitha cumi*[2]; and he has confused the topography by his emendations. But from the uncials we learn that

[1] John xxi. 2 : 1, 28, iii. 23, iv. 5. [2] Mark v. 41.

the last page of the Gospel of Mark was lost, and a new end written to it later[1]; that some scribe added the angel to the story of the pool of Bethesda[2]: that another cut out the words "His parents," referring to Joseph and Mary.[3] In the first Epistle of John a whole clause was added, and even our English Bible regards another verse as doubtful.[4] Such corruptions of the text are not matters of opinion, but of knowledge; and, since already in the fourth century there were variations, we cannot feel certain that yet more important additions may not have been made to the early gospels. The Ebionite Gospel contained no allusion to the Virgin Birth of Christ. Marcion's gospel followed Luke, but equally omitted the first chapters. They may have been cut out because not credited by these schools of Christian doctrine; but at least we see clearly that the belief in this wondrous birth—to which Paul never refers—was not universal in the earliest age of Christianity, any more than it is to-day. There were, from early days, two schools of belief: that of the Palestine Church, believing Jesus to have been the son of Joseph and Mary inspired with the Holy Spirit at baptism; and that of Paul, to whom Jesus was the incarnation of the divine Wisdom whereby the world was created at first. From the first school sprang the simple Christianity of the second century, but afterwards an asceticism which was self-destructive: from the second arose the mysticism of the Gnostics, who denied to Jesus any human body at all. The creed of the Catholic Church was the final harmonising of antagonistic views.

ii. **Primitive.**—The first Christians were poor and humble, and could not afford to build great churches,

[1] Mark xvi. 9–20. [3] Luke ii. 43, see verse 41, where it is left in.
[2] John v. 4. [4] 1 John v. 7–8, ii. 23.

or to set up inscriptions. We have therefore very little monumental evidence of the earliest age. Tacitus, who is bitter against them, hardly distinguishes them from other Jews who believed in the Messiah, and of whom Suetonius speaks as having been expelled by the Emperor Claudius, because they "made frequent tumults excited by Chrestus"[1] about 45 A.D. Pliny the younger, writing from Pontus to Trajan in 113 A.D.,[2] about the spread of the new "superstition" in towns, villages, and country places, among many of all ages and conditions, is glad to report that "the temples which were almost abandoned have begun to be again frequented," and that the sacrifices "which found few buyers" are again exposed for sale. He hesitates therefore to punish the poor converts, who said "that their only fault was to meet habitually on fixed days before sunrise, to sing in turns a hymn to Christus as to a god, and to vow—not such and such crimes, but not to steal, or rob, or commit adultery, not to fail in sworn faith, not to deny a trust asked back; that then they used to retire and meet again to take a meal together—an ordinary and quite innocent meal; and that even this they had ceased to do since the edict . . . forbidding heresies."

In Palestine itself, in the middle of the second century, this simple Christianity is described by Justin Martyr. The little churches were modelled on the synagogue system, not on that of the temple. They had their elders, and their ministers or servants. Like the apostles, the converts were peasants or artisans; and this priestless congregation was led by some "presiding brother," as the Moslem prayers to-day are led by some respected elder. Those who assembled were mostly relations, or neighbours who had long known one another. The "Kiss of Peace"

[1] Tacitus, "Annals," xv. 44; Suetonius, "Claudius," 25.

[2] Pliny, "Epist." x.

was thus a natural and harmless salutation, not as yet a cause of scandal. Justin Martyr,[1] himself born near Shechem, describes the meetings for first communion of the newly baptized or "enlightened," in Palestine, and the weekly services. "On the day called after the sun those who live in the towns and country meet in one place, and read the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, as long as time allows. When the reader has finished, the presiding brother addresses to those present words of admonition and exhortation, urging them to follow such good teaching. Then we all rise together and send our prayers up to heaven; and, as we have already said, the prayers ended, the bread, the wine and the water are sent round; the president to his utmost uttering prayers and thanksgivings, and the people assenting by saying Amen. The offerings for which thanks are given are then distributed: each receives his share; and they are sent to the absent by ministrants (or deacons). Those who are prosperous, and desire to give, give what they like, each according as he decides. The product of the collection is placed in the hands of the president, who helps the orphans, and widows, and those in distress from sickness or other cause, those in chains, and the strangers who come. He has, in short, the care of all those who are in need."

As late as 200 A.D. rites equally simple are described by Tertullian[2] at Carthage, when the numbers of the Christians had greatly increased in the West. He speaks of a first prayer before reclining (at the common meal), and of washing the hands after eating. Each was then asked to sing a hymn to God, and a final prayer followed. But the recovery of the celebrated "Didache"—the oldest Christian manual in existence—

[1] Justin Martyr, "Apol." i. 65–7.

[2] Tertullian, "Apol." 39.

shows that even as early as about 100 A.D. the teaching and rites of Christians were of the same character. The original work seems to have been called "The Two Ways"[1] including only six chapters, but it was early expanded into the "Teaching of the Lord to the Twelve Apostles." This tract recalls the teaching of Justin Martyr, and of Irenæus, in their protests against the sins and superstitions of their age. The Two Ways are those of life and death, the narrow path and the broad. The Christian is to love God and his neighbour, to bless his enemies, to fast and give alms in secret. He must not practise witchcraft, or infanticide, or duplicity; he must not be an augur, or use charms or astrological emblems, or sacrifices; nor may he lie or steal; he must be meek, and reverence holy men, and help the poor. If a slave, he must obey his master. He must publicly confess his sins in the congregation. "If thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord thou shalt be perfect; but if thou art not able, do what thou canst." The Christian may not "give orders in bitterness" to his servant or handmaid, and must abstain especially from offerings to idols, "for it is a service of dead gods."

The second part contains directions for Christian rites, and concludes with the description of the Last Day. Baptism is to be in running water after fasting; and two weekly fast-days are established (in the Greek version): the prayer thrice a day is to be the Lord's Prayer, "as the Lord commanded in His gospels." The "Prayer of the Cup" was that used at the Com-

[1] The Greek text was found by Bryennios, in the Holy Sepulchre Monastery of the Fanar Quarter at Constantinople, in 1873. The Latin text, *De Duabus Viis* (see Offord in "Proc. Bib. Arch. Soc." March 1904), omits the notice of public confession, and adds a Trinitarian gloria. Other variations occur in the short Coptic version and the Arabic translation. The tract forms the basis of "Apostolic Canons" from the fourth to the ninth centuries.

munion: "We thank thee, O Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou madest known to us by Jesus Thy servant,[1] for the broken bread. We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known to us by Jesus Thy servant. To Thee be glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered on the mountains, and being brought together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom. For Thine is the glory and the power, by Jesus Christ for ever." But none may eat or drink this Eucharist who are not baptized into the name of the Lord, and "after being satisfied" a second prayer of thanksgiving is to be said: "We thank Thee, O Holy Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou hast enshrined in our hearts, and for the knowledge, and faith, and immortality, which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus Thy servant. To Thee be glory for ever . . . Hosanna to the Son of David . . . Maranatha (Come, O Lord). But permit the prophets to give thanks as much as they wish." Thus extemporary prayer was not forbidden. The Church recognised apostles, and prophets, as well as bishops (or overseers) and deacons (or ministrants).[2] They must be "meek men," honoured with prophets and teachers, "as in the Gospel of our God." The apostle[3] who remains a guest for three days is a false prophet: "any prophet who speaks in the spirit ye shall not try or test, for every sin shall be forgiven, but his sin shall not be forgiven. Any prophet who orders a table shall not eat thereof. Any approved true prophet who makes assemblies for a worldly mystery, but does not teach others to do what he does, shall not be judged by you. For his judgment is in the hands of God." He is a "Christ trafficker"; but the true

[1] Didache, ix. In three cases *Pais*, that is "servant," or "child."
[2] *Ibid.* x., xi., xv. [3] *Ibid.* xi.–xvi.

prophet is to receive first fruits; and if there be no prophet they are to be given to the poor. For there will be false prophets in the last days, when the "world deceiver" comes, and when after many signs the saints shall fly forth in heaven at the voice of the trumpet, on the day of their resurrection.

Such was the Catholic Church in the days of its early simplicity. But there were tares among the wheat—differences of belief, growing asceticism, sacerdotalism, and mysticism, which developed further in the third century, even before the deluge of corruption which overwhelmed the Church, when crowds of superstitious and self-seeking men followed the new cult adopted by the "divine Emperor," who claimed to have been inspired to discover the tomb of Christ under the Venus temple at Jerusalem. The old tolerance was lost when the officers of the Church became really the nominees of the Emperor—though the form of popular election was still retained. Justin Martyr[1] believed in the millennium, but shows the true Christian spirit when he says that "many who belong to the pure and pious faith, and are true Christians, think otherwise." Irenæus, the founder of Christianity in Gaul, did good service to the faith when he persuaded Victor, bishop of Rome, not to cause schism on the question of the calculation of Easter about 196 A.D.[2] The Council of Trent appealed to the "unanimous consent of the Fathers," but it is doubtful if any of them would have escaped the stake in the twelfth century. We study their works under great difficulties, because we have only late manuscripts or copies, and these have been corrupted by monkish scribes. But even as they now are we find many differences of belief and custom among them. Justin Martyr seems to have believed that the Jordan

[1] "Trypho," lxxx.

[2] See Renan, "Marc Aurèle," 1882, pp. 199–203.

was in flames when Jesus was baptized. Irenæus seems to have held that Christ lived to the age of fifty years. Clement of Alexandria (though his editor, Cassiodorus, avowedly altered the text when he thought it unorthodox) is still found to have believed that Christ felt no sufferings, and that His body required no food, even if he did not credit the perpetual virginity of Mary. Tertullian denied the latter dogma, but (like Origen) he believed the soul to be corporeal, and he finally joined the wild revivalists of Phrygia, and credited the statements of a Montanist sister who had seen a soul—"the densified breath of God in man." He also, like all his contemporaries, firmly believed in demons and exorcism.[1] The great Origen, who understood Greek and Jewish philosophy, was proclaimed a heretic by the Council of Constantinople, in 553 A.D., because he held that pre-existent souls were imprisoned in bodies for punishment; that Christ's human soul was pre-existent, and united with the divine soul before the Incarnation; that mortal bodies become ætherial at the resurrection; and that all men, and all demons, will finally be saved by the mediation of Christ. The Catholicity of the second and third centuries permitted, therefore, a wide range of opinion. It was not yet restricted by the creeds which bound the Church with iron bands. Tertullian was the first to formulate his beliefs. The great schism of Nicea was produced by a creed from which that known as the "Apostles'" developed about 390 A.D. Whatever we may think of the necessity of creeds, we find that they have too often tended to produce schism among those who forgot the commandment, "judge not," which the early writer of the Didache observes.

[1] Justin, "Trypho," lxxxviii.; Irenæus, "Hæres," II. xxii. 5–6; Clement of Alexandria, "Strom," VI. ix; Tertullian, "De Carne Christi," xxiii., xxxv.; "De Anima," ix., xlvi. Origen, see Clark's "Antenicene Library," 1869, vol. x. p. vii.

It was not through any such dogmas that Christianity won its way throughout the Roman empire, but by the kindly and quiet life of many whose names are not mentioned in history. It is believed that texts of senators and soldiers, in the third century, in Asia Minor, are Christian, but the most certain seem to have been carved for humble folk. "I, Aurelia Domna, with my son Konon, and my son-in-law Peter, place this for the sake of the memory of my sweetest husband, John, the presbyter," is a badly spelt example. In North Syria, just after the establishment of Christianity, we find the cross still absent, and the spelling Chrēstos ("good") for Christos, still used. "Help, good Jesus. God is One. Thalasis set it up. As thou sayest, dear, and be it double to thee. Year 380 (of Antioch). Come, O Christ."[1] In Italy many inscriptions in the catacombs, and perhaps some pictures, date back to the third century. Many of the short texts breathe the spirit of family love: "My most sweet child," "My most sweet wife," "My most dear husband," "My innocent dove," "My worthy father," "My worthy mother," "Innocent lamb," "They lived together without any quarrel or complaint, without taking or giving offence." These words occur in catacombs where Christians hid their faith under pagan emblems, when the good shepherd might stand for the lamb-bearing Apollo, and the divine love for the soul was symbolised by Cupid and Psyche. The Old Testament designs are often quite as indefinite, though including supposed representations of Jonah, Daniel, and Moses, or of Noah in his ark, mingled with figures of Orpheus. The dates of these pictures, and of those representing priests, and "Orantes," or

[1] Hamilton, "Researches in Asia Minor," 1842, ii.; No. 393 from Kadun Khana. Ramsay, "The Church in the Roman Empire," 1893, p. 434. Waddington, "Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie," 1870; No. 2704, dating 331 A.D., at Khatura.

the Agape supper, are for the most part unfortunately unknown.[1]

This simple Christianity did not satisfy the various sects whose heresies, or "private opinions," were so numerous in the second century, and even after the establishment of the Church. The Ebionites (or "needy") were originally the followers of the apostles who fled (before 70 A.D.) to Pella in the Jordan valley, and to Kaukabah in Bashan. But Ebionites, and Gnostics[2] (or "wise ones"), developed many strange ascetic customs and mystic beliefs which were not Christian, but borrowed from the philosophy and superstition of Greece, Persia, and India. Our Lord, though He fasted, as did pious Hebrews, was not an ascetic. He went to the Pharisee's dinner, and to the wedding feast at Kanah. He loved little children, and bade us rejoice with those who rejoice, as well as weep with those who weep. But Buddhist asceticism had influenced many hermits in Syria, and Palestine, two centuries or more before He was born. The Essenes (Hasaya or "hermits") were an order having many ideas borrowed from the hermits of India. The Therapeutai (or "ministrants") of Egypt, said to have been described by Philo, were of the same class. The Christian hermits, like Hilarion in the Gaza desert, or Paul and Antony in upper Egypt, retired from the world to indulge in hypnotic trances, and saw visions of angels and devils, centaurs and seductive fair ones, in and after the third century; they sought that union with deity which the pagan Plotinus, and Porphyry his disciple, equally strove to attain in the same age. Round these holy men gathered disciples,

[1] Lundy, "Monumental Christianity," 1876, p. 108; Stanley, "Christian Institutions," 1881, p. 261; Renan, "Marc Aurèle," 1882, pp. 536, 542.

[2] King, "Gnostics," 2nd edit. 1887; Mansell, "Gnostic Heresies," 1875.

male and female, who lived in caves and huts, and, as their numbers increased, in monasteries, at the site of the hermit's cell. They invaded Rome in the fourth century, and they were then numerous in Asia. You may still visit the caves of Greek hermits in Palestine, and see the solitary pillars on which they stood, even in the middle ages, in imitation of Simon Stylites the Syrian ascetic of the fifth century. These monks increased in numbers until they became a dominant force in the Church, and their extravagances increased constantly, while their ignorant fanaticism became a danger to Church and State alike. They accepted the later Buddhist pessimism, which made matter evil and delusive. They tortured their bodies like Hindu Yogis, to emancipate their souls. They not only murdered the innocent Hypatia at Alexandria in 415 A.D.; but they terrorised the second council of Ephesus in 448 A.D., when Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, fell under the clubs of the Syrian monks following Barsumas. The spread of monasticism is said by Lecky to have been one of the causes which led to the fall of the Roman empire. Asceticism was one of the earliest diseases from which the pure faith suffered in East and West alike. Such practices also led, as in India, to a contrary extreme; and revivalists like the Montanists of Phrygia, at the end of the second century, went from hysterical exaltation to lengths of passion which—as in later cases—resulted in licence and immorality. The Kiss of Peace, and the Love Feast, were abused as congregations increased, till the resulting scandals were put down by law; and the relations of monks to their sister nuns were severely reprobated by Chrysostom.

Ebionite views are supposed to have spread even to Rome; and the Clementine Homilies[1] were based on

[1] Homily xiv. 11, Peter's eucharist of bread and salt; in viii. 15, abstinence from flesh is commanded.

the Didache, while the novel called the "Clementine Recognitions," which Renan (following the pre-scientific views of Baur) imagined to represent a real account of a conflict between Peter and Paul, develops Ebionite ideas at the beginning of the third century. In the Homilies we find that, while the early patriarchs are extolled, the later Hebrew prophets are renounced, which marks the growth of anti-Jewish ideas among the ascetics of the East.[1] In the Recognitions James alone is regarded as the true apostle. From the Ebionites came later sects of baptists, who spread over Babylonia, and were known to Muhammad as Sabiūn or "baptisers," while among these a strange Gnosticism also developed, which is still represented by the ideas of surviving Mendaites.[2]

Of the Gnostics, or "wise ones," we know very little from their own writings, or from monuments, and we depend chiefly on the accounts given by the Fathers. Many very different ideas are included under the term, ranging from philosophical mysticism and allegory to gross superstition and conscious fraud. But the leading principle of real Gnostics appears to have been the attempt to reconcile science and faith—or rather the pseudo-science and pseudo-religion of the age. They accepted Christian beliefs, and mingled them with Platonic philosophy, with Eleusinian mysteries, or with more ancient superstitions, and finally with Persian and Indian ideas. Among surviving Gnostic books the "Poemandres," or "Shepherd of Men," is a worthless attempt to Platonise the religion of "the cup."[3] The Oxyrhynchus Logoi, or sayings attributed to Christ found recently in an

[1] Clem. Hom. iii. 20, xvii. 9, 10, xviii. 14; Clem. Recog. IV. xxxv.

[2] See Forlong, "Faiths of Man," 1906, *s. v.* Mandæans, and Sabians.

[3] See Chambers, "Hermes Trismegistus," 1882. "Poemandres," iv. 4.

Egyptian papyrus, appear also to be the work of a Gnostic of the third century, holding strong Ebionite views as to the Sabbath. The Pistis Sophia, discovered by Bruce in 1842, is equally curious and worthless,[1] but is the only work of the Valentinian Gnostics that has survived, excepting the epitaph discovered on the Via Latina,[2] written in Greek by a sad husband whose wife is taken to "the light of the Father," "the pure, incorruptible myrrh of Christos," "the divine faces of the Æons."

The numerous gems with Hebrew texts, or with Hebrew words written in Greek, were amulets which may in some cases (when the names are such as are known to have been used by certain sects) be rightly called Gnostic. But Origen himself believed in "words of power," such as the Hebrew names Sabaoth and Adonai[3]: and many like charms were sold by Jewish wizards, while others are Mithraic or pagan.

There were two great schools of Gnosticism, the Syrian and the Egyptian; but there were many other superstitious sects, and popular impostors. The Ophites, or "serpent worshippers," distinguished the supreme God of Wisdom from the Demiurge, or "creator of common men" not born of the Spirit. The latter was identified with Jehovah as a cruel and ignorant deity. To this Persian dualism they added

[1] "Koptisch Gnostische Schriften," C. Schmidt, 1905; and Harnack on "Pistis Sophia" in "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur," vol. vii. part 2.

[2] Renan, "Marc Aurèle," 1882, p. 147.

[3] Origen, "Against Celsus," I. xxiv. The word Abraxas on gems is Gnostic and probably Hebrew (*Abrak-s-esh*, "I bless what happens"), like Abracadabra (*Abrak-ha-dabra*, "I bless the deed"), or Ablathanabla (*Ablat-ha-nabla*, "I give life to the corpse"). The figures of the Agathodaimon serpent, and of Khnuphis, and Harpocrates, indicate the influence of Egyptian superstition; while the name Iao preserves the old pronunciation of Yahu or Jehovah; and Horus on the lotus is called Semes Ailam or the "Eternal Sun."

the mysteries of Eleusis, the orgies of Cybele, Adonis, and Osiris, the Babylonian astrology, and Platonic philosophy; yet believed in a mystic Christos and Sophia (or Wisdom), using the Pauline epistles.[1] The Cainites reversed the Old and New Testament alike, and their "Gospel of Judas" commended the traitor as an agent for the fulfilment of prophecy. The later Adamites worshipped naked in synagogues, teaching a licentious doctrine. But the most notorious Gnostic was Marcus, whose gospel contained the story of Christ at school, which seems to have been borrowed from the legend of Buddha. His Eucharist was poured by a woman from a small cup into a larger one held by the priest, and effervesced to overflow. He devoted himself to ladies "well-bred and elegantly attired, and of great wealth," and talked no doubt to them of Plato and love as glibly as any modern impostor. He anticipated American mystics in performing "Spiritual Marriages": he gave philtres and love potions; and among his followers hysterical prophesying led to vice. They said that, being "perfected" in experience, they would not be reincarnate—a Buddhist idea. Others again had pictures and statues of Christ which they crowned, and set up with those of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, like modern followers of Comte.[2] Every modern folly, down to Mrs. Eddy's, appears to have its parallel among Gnostics.

The Samaritan Gnosis[3] begins with Simon Magus, who claimed to be a divine incarnation. He was a native of Gitta (*Jett*) in Samaria; and Menander his disciple—who also claimed to be divine—was a yet greater magician, and administered a baptism which was to prevent death. Saturninus of Antioch followed Menander, and was a rigid ascetic. He spoke of a

[1] "Hippolytus," v. 7.
[2] Irenæus, "Hæres," I. xiii., xx., xxi., xxvi.
[3] Acts viii. 5, 9–10; Justin Martyr, "Apol." I. xxvi.

phantom Christ, and mingled Persian dualism with the Indian prohibition of animal food—like Tatian and the Encratites, or "abstainers," who did not allow wine even for the Eucharist.[1] Bardesanes, born near Edessa, also held "Docetic" views, believing Christ's sufferings to have been only apparent, and His body spiritual: the hymns of his son Harmonius were used in Syria till superseded by those of St. Ephraem.[2] These men taught free will like Aristotle, and denounced Chaldean superstitions. The second great school was that of Basilides and Valentinus in Egypt, which claimed—about the middle of the second century—to be based on a secret teaching of Christ to Matthew,[3] but which was founded on Greek and Indian philosophy. The strange allegories of the Æons ("ages," or "emanations"), and of a ghostly Christ, and spiritual believers, developing the mysticism of the fourth gospel, has no interest for us now; but these teachings were a formidable hindrance to Catholic Christianity in their day. In 276 A.D. appeared Manes,[4] who was skinned alive by the Magi in Persia, but whose gigantic system still prospered in the fourth century, and spread to Gaul and Spain, where it survived a thousand years. Terebinthus, the disciple of Manes, died in Judea. He called himself a Buddha, and Manes claimed to be the Holy Ghost. But the attempt to create an universal religion of secret scepticism failed, though it was revived by Moslem heretics.

Irenæus was justified in saying of the Gnostics "they speak like the Church, but they think otherwise." Cerinthus in Syria was said to have lived

[1] Harnack, "Brod und Wasser," 1891.

[2] Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles." iv. 30; Sozomen, "Hist. Eccles." iii. 16.

[3] "Hippolytus," vii. 20.

[4] Cyril of Jerusalem, "Catech. Lect." vi. 12–13.

before 100 A.D., and the fourth gospel was written to oppose his doctrine that Christ (the divine Wisdom) descended on the human Jesus at baptism and left Him at the crucifixion (as Muhammad also believed): Carpocrates—called the "first Gnostic"—held the same belief, which survived even in the fifth century. He pretended that Christ taught a secret doctrine of faith and love, all else being mere human opinion. His followers became licentious like Prodicus and the Adamites, and Prodicus produced "secret books of Zoroaster." Elxai under Trajan, was an Essene, or an Ebionite, rejecting Paul, and insisting on baptism. He compelled marriage, but forbade the use of flesh.[1] These various sects had their own gospels; and two of them survive, belonging to the Docetæ, who believed Christ to have been a phantom. One of these is the "Gospel of Thomas," known in Syriac, Greek, and Latin; the other is represented by the fragment of the worthless "Gospel of Peter" recently discovered. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the "Gospel of the Egyptians,"[2] which contained mystic sayings attributed to Jesus, but evidently spurious. The "Gospel of the Hebrews" was also a legendary work, which has happily been lost. These were the germs of apocryphal gospels of the fifth century; and the "Gospel of Nicodemus," supposed to be ancient, was given a prologue and an appendix in this later age of superstition.

There was thus plenty to cause the enemy to blaspheme even in the first century, when the pagan priests calumniated the Church, and abused Christians as haters of mankind, "a third race," who refused to burn incense to Cæsar till compelled, and who would not serve the state as soldiers: they were eaters of

[1] Irenæus, "Hæres," i. 2, iii. 11; Clement of Alexandria, "Stromata," I. iii. 4, vii. 7; "Hippolytus," ix. 13, 15, 16.

[2] "Stromata," III. iii. 9, 13.

babies, secretly addicted to horrible immorality, a pestilent sect of atheists, worshipping the "ass-priest," or the cross. The bad emperors were incited to persecute them, but the great Antonines tolerated all.[1] About 180 A.D. the Church had won its way from Greece to Gaul, and from Rome to Carthage, and its importance was such as to merit the attention and the severe criticism even of philosophers like Celsus. Hadrian is believed[2] to have written to Servianus in 131 A.D. about Christianity in Egypt: "there those who adore Serapis are also Christians, and those who call themselves bishops of the Christ are devotees of Serapis. There is not a president of a synagogue, Jew, or Samaritan, or Christian priest, who does not add to his functions those of an astrologer, diviner, and impostor. The patriarch himself when he comes to Egypt is forced by some to worship Serapis, by others to adore Christ." "Their only god is money: that is the deity that Christians, Jews, and all others adore."

Celsus in his "True Account" attacked the whole Bible, and was the predecessor of Strauss. He said,[3] "It is only foolish low persons void of insight, slaves, women, children, of whom the teachers of the Divine Word wish to make converts." "Those who perform most disgraceful tricks in the market place, and gather crowds round them, would never approach a meeting of wise men, or dare to exhibit their arts among them, but wherever they see young men, or a mob of slaves, or a gathering of stupid people, there they thrust themselves in and show themselves off." "We see indeed in private houses wool-workers, leather makers, and fullers, persons quite uneducated and of rustic character, not venturing to utter a word in presence of their

[1] Tertullian, "Apol." 5.
[2] Renan, "L'Église Chrétienne," 1879, p. 189.
[3] Origen, "Against Celsus," iii. 49, 50, 55, 59, 73.

elders and wise masters; but when they get hold of the children privately, and of certain women as ignorant as themselves, they pour forth wonderful assertions to the effect that these ought not to give heed to their father or to their teachers, but should obey them: that the former are foolish and stupid, and can neither know nor do any really good thing, being busy about empty trifles: that they alone know how men ought to live; and that if the children obey them they will both be happy themselves, and will make their home happy also." "Any sinner, any one without sense, any feeble-minded person, in short any one who is miserable, may come, for the Kingdom of God is for him." "No wise man believes the Gospel, for he is driven away by the multitude who cleave thereto." It is thus that the philosopher condemns the poor street preachers, and the slaves in great houses, to whom the Sermon on the Mount brought comfort. "Why," he says, "do they prefer sinners?" They remind him "of a crowd of bats, of ants coming out of their hole, or of frogs in a marsh, or worms": they despise constituted authority, and the Oracle of Dodona, and others credited by the Peripatetics. They believe in angels, but not in the demons who are the ministers of God Almighty, and who ought to be propitiated by sacrifices. He refers to the Ophites. He asks why only Mary witnessed the Resurrection; and thinks the earthquake and darkness at the Crucifixion to be mere legends. He disbelieves the Virgin Birth, but he credits the Jewish calumny which made Jesus the son of the soldier Pantherus; for "No god, or son of a god has come down or will come down."[1] Origen, when he replied to this "True Account" later, admitted much which we now deny,

[1] "Against Celsus," iii. 62, iv. 23, viii. 55–66, vii. 3, 25, 31, vi. 24–31, vii. 53, ii. 53, i. 28–38, v. 2, 31, 40. Tal. Bab. *Sanhedrin*, 107 *b*. *Sabbath* 104 *b*.

and said that demons were evil beings, and Old Testament stories only allegories; but his quotation from Plutarch was true—"the mills of God grind slowly." The Church was not an Ophite sect, but was struggling against the fashionable Mithra worship, and Isis worship of the age, which infected the Gnostic systems and finally corrupted Christianity itself. Incense and idols, transubstantiation, and holy water,[1] were still peculiar to paganism; and Celsus the critic was as credulous about beliefs in which he had grown up as any of the simplest Christians.

From such criticism we may turn to the actual development of Christian rites, and organisation, as known from monuments or from the writings of the Fathers. Our Lord commanded men to pray in private; but when pious meetings of Christians became usual, a "presiding brother" was needed, and became the treasurer of the congregation. Paul called himself both an apostle, or "messenger," and a minister (*diakonos*) or "servant." He speaks, in his great epistles, of prophets or "preachers," of "leaders," "teachers," "pastors," and "evangelists," ministering to the holy people. The apostles of Palestine did not expect to have any successors, for they believed that the End would come in their own lifetime. But after 70 A.D., the Pauline congregations were further organised, and the elders began to elect permanent "overseers" (*episkopoi*) who were aided by the ministrants, or deacons. Such an overseer must be a staid married man, known to be sincere, and not a new convert who might desire to become a "lord over the inheritance."[2]

The term Episkopos (bishop) was an ancient and well-known civil title. The Greeks had such "over-

[1] Tertullian, "De Baptismo," 5.

[2] 2 Cor. xi. 23; Col. i. 25; Rom. xii. 6–8; 1 Thess. v. 12; Ephes. iv. 11; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii., iv., v.; James v. 14.

seers" as early as the time of the Peloponnesian war, and the term is often used, in the Bashan inscriptions, of magistrates.[1] Thus at Salkhad we find a pagan text dated 252 A.D. beginning with the pagan invocation "good luck," and recording the names of four Episkopoi which are clearly not Christian.[1] Even in the time of Tertullian—about 200 A.D.—when the word "Sacerdos" begins to creep in, and the "Ordo" is superior in honour to the "Plebs," we still find it stated that "where there is no arrangement for the meeting of the congregation you both offer, and dip, and are a Sacerdos to yourself alone."[2] Half a century later the Sacerdos claimed to be the successor of the Levite and entitled to tithes: the bishop was no longer to be a farmer or trader and received a stipend. But as men of patrician rank began to join the Church the old objection to the neophyte was discarded. Cyprian[3] was elected by popular suffrage, with the consent of other bishops, while still a recent convert. Even in the latter years of the fourth century Ambrose of Milan became bishop, by popular acclamation, while yet a layman[4]; Eusebius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia was not even baptized; and other cases are known where an important leader became bishop at once on conversion. But this gradual growth of sacerdotalism led to the "Ecclesia" being regarded as consisting only of the clergy, though the word—as used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament—meant properly the "congregation."

Tertullian called the Holy Spirit the "vicar of Christ"; he says sarcastically, "No doubt he is a

[1] Waddington, "Inscript. Grecques et Lat. de la Syrie," 1876, p. 474, No 1990: see also No. 2298.

[2] Tertullian, "De Exhort. Cast," 7; "De Virg. Veland," 9; "De Præscript Hær." 11.

[3] Benson, "Cyprian," 1897.

[4] Paulinus, "Vita," iii.

Pontifex Maximus who calls himself a bishop of bishops." He knew not that mediæval Popes would usurp such titles, and that the priest-king, as successor of the divine Augusti, would assume the office of the old Roman pontiff who "made the bridge" leading to heaven.[1] In his time confession of sin was made publicly in the congregation; and even in the fourth century Chrysostom is strong against that auricular confession which was to become so terrible an engine of priestly tyranny.[2] Cyprian, about 254 A.D., stoutly opposed the pretensions of Stephen, bishop of Rome, to authority outside Italy, and wrote to him as a "brother" and equal, denying the primacy of Peter. "Our colleague Stephen," he says (as to a case in Spain), "was a long way off and ignorant of the facts."[3] Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, wrote to Cyprian to say: "That the Roman Church does not in all things observe the primitive tradition, and alleges the authority of the Apostles in vain, any one may know seeing that, about the celebration of Easter, and many other sacraments of religion, there are some diversities among them, and all things are not observed in the same way they are observed in Jerusalem. So too in many other provinces many things are varied to suit local and human differences, and yet the peace and unity of the Catholic Church have not been departed from as Stephen has now dared to do."[4]

Every bishop was called a pope in the third century, as every priest is still called in the East—a "papa" or "father." It was Hildebrand, in the eleventh century, who announced that there was only one Pope[5]; but

[1] Tertullian, "De Virg. Veland," 1; "De Pudicit," 1.

[2] Tertullian, "De Penitent," 9; Chrysostom, "Hom." v.

[3] Cyprian, "Epit." lxvii. 5.

[4] Benson's "Cyprian," p. 385.

[5] Paul I. in 757 A.D. was, however, called "Universal Pope" by the Romans. See Gregorovius, "Hist. of City of Rome," English trans., 1894, ii. p. 308.

the pretensions of Rome were never tolerated in Asia or in Egypt. Yet even in the third century, when each bishop was equal in his own see, they together formed a powerful federation which demanded government recognition after the Decian persecution. "Authority loves authority," and the sacerdotal Church was gradually approaching its compact with an empire which was tending to the establishment of the hereditary principle.

The "cup of blessing" was as much a part of the Passover rite, in the time of our Lord, as was the custom of "reclining at ease" to eat the unleavened bread. The apostles who saw their living Master break that bread and drink from that cup, could not have attached a material meaning to His symbolic words. He was the victim of that fatal Passover, and bade them "Remember Me" henceforth, as other anniversaries came round. Even the mystic language of the fourth gospel is guarded by the warning: "The words that I speak to you are spirit."[1] The Corinthians, who looked on the Supper as a communal meal, like those of the Spartans and Cretans, were condemned by Paul for forgetting that it was a sacred memorial rite. The scandals thus arising led to the weekly Communion (on Saturday or on Sunday) being gradually divorced from the Love Feast, till in the third century it became a formal symbol by itself, an Eucharist daily celebrated fasting, before sunrise, and not an actual supper after sunset consecrated by a final rite. Had it been preserved like the Passover, as a family feast, the character of the Supper might have remained purely memorial. Home communion was still practised in Cyprian's age, but now only survives in grace after meat. The Christians in Cyprian's time often took home their portions of bread and wine, and reserved them to eat before their first meal. But he

[1] 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 27; Mishnah, *Pesakhim*, x. 2, 7; John vi. 63.

did not regard this as a true Eucharist; and new scandals arose on account of the superstitious ignorance of the converts. Basil, in the fourth century, says that in Egypt "for the most part every one had the Communion in his own house." Augustin, in 430 A.D., says that some even made a poultice of the sacred bread to cure sickness, so that the idea of a magical charm attached to the elements among the ignorant, even in the fifth century. But reservation of the elements in churches was not practised till four hundred years later.[1]

The language of the Christian Fathers on this subject is based on that of Paul and of the Gospels, and we cannot be certain that allusions to transubstantiation in works by Origen, Justin, or Irenæus may not be corruptions of the text. Cyril of Jerusalem, however, in the fourth century, says that the "spiritual sacrifice" is "transformed"[2]; but even he calls the elements an "antitype." The "Real Presence" was denied by Berengarius in 1045, long before Wyclif (in 1381) denied the dogma of transubstantiation, which Innocent III. imposed on the Church in the end of the twelfth century. Yet the idea of a communion with deity through sacred loaves and sacred drink was very ancient and wide-spread—found in Egypt and Persia, and extant still in Tibet, where the dough image of a three-headed person is distributed among the so-called Buddhist worshippers.[3] In India the Soma drink is the blood of Vishnu; and just as the pagan material conception of the Son of God was brought into the Church by converts, so was the mysticism of pagan Rome brought into the rite of the Memorial Supper. The worship of Mithra

[1] Tertullian, "De Orat." 19; "Ad Uxorem," ii. 5; Basil, "Epit." 39; Augustin—see Smith's "Dict. Christian Antiq." *s.v.* Reservation.

[2] Origen, "Against Celsus," viii.; Cyril, "Catech. Lect." v. 20–22.

[3] Waddell, "Buddhism in Tibet," 1895, p. 528.

was common in Rome in the second century. It included the rite in which sacred loaves, and the sacred Haoma drink, were offered to the god of day. Justin Martyr and Tertullian alike regarded this rite as resembling the Christian Eucharist. The former says: "Which wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithra, commanding the same thing to be done. For that bread and a cup of water are used, with certain incantations, in the mystic rites for one about to be initiated, you either know or can learn." Transubstantiation was a feature of this rite. The ancient Yashts or "hymns" of Persia (400 B.C.) celebrate the Haoma, both as a sacrifice and as a god whose spirit was communicated by the sacred drink to those who offered it to the gods.[1] We can therefore understand that converts who had been Mithraic initiates retained their old beliefs as to such communion with deity, even when partaking of the Memorial Supper; and as the Church became corrupted by paganism, after its compact with the empire, the strange doctrine to which Rome still adheres gradually became the general belief.

The primitive age of the Church, strictly speaking, came to an end in 325 A.D.; and after this date Christianity became the victim—not the cause—of the dark ages. From about 180 A.D. the Churches shared the general decay of Roman civilisation, due to the gross materialism which was produced by wealth and luxury. The light which had shone in the darkness when the darkness "could not compass it," burned dim and dimmer in the fogs of the world, as the empire was gradually transferred to the provincials, and as philosophy gave place to barbarous Gothic superstitions. The Churches, organised under their bishops, represented, it is true, a minority still,

[1] Justin Martyr, "Apol." 66; Tertullian, "De Corona," 15; Yashts, "Sacred Books of the East," 1883, vol. xxiii. pp. 102, 114, 142.

but it was a strong minority, and Christianity had a hold on the masses that no other cult could claim. A sacerdotal Church was also an institution very different to deal with from the early Church of the poor. It was more willing to regard expediency, and to burn incense to Cæsar than of old. In the third century Christians were allowed to use the civil basilicas of Rome for their rites. After the abdication of Diocletian a new policy was brought in, and the fourth century opened with the decree of the dying emperor Galerius, whose edict, published in 305, gave public recognition to the Church.[1] "We were particularly desirous of reclaiming into the way of reason and nature the deluded Christians who had renounced the religion and ceremonies instituted by their fathers." "The edicts which we have published to enforce the worship of the gods having exposed many of the Christians to danger and distress, many having suffered death, and many more who still persist in their impious folly being left destitute of any public exercise of religion, we are disposed to extend to these unhappy men the effects of our wonted clemency. We permit them therefore freely to profess their private opinions, and to assemble in their conventicles without fear or molestation, provided always that they preserve a due respect to the established laws and government. By another rescript we shall signify our intentions to the judges and magistrates; and we hope that our indulgence will engage the Christians to offer up their prayers to the god whom they adore for our safety, and prosperity: for their own: and for that of the republic." This was the first proclamation of peace, and the Charter of the Church. The Edict of Milan (in 313), issued by Constantine, was also one of general toleration, restoring to Christians

[1] Lactantius (in Cæcilius, "De Mort. Persec," chap. 34), Gibbon, chap. xvi.

civil and religious rights, and the places of worship and lands of which the Church had been deprived during the struggle for power which, at length, left him sole emperor in 324, when he announced his adoption of Christianity as the Imperial cult, and called next year the Council of Nicea, where he presided as "bishop of bishops," and secured the actual nomination of the Christian leaders.

Thus Christianity became the court religion; and the thousand bishops of the East, with eight hundred in the West, became Imperial officials. Christianity was now the road to worldly success, and the Church was immediately swamped by the flood of ignorant and superstitious converts who followed the "divine emperor" in adopting the approved cultus. Henceforth her task was more difficult than ever. Sincere differences of belief had not disturbed the unity of the Catholic Church, but these were now seized on by ambitious prelates, and became the battle cries of party. The question was, how to deal with such worldliness, with the turbulence of monkish fanatics incited by crafty leaders, with the customs and superstitions of the crowds who demanded baptism, yet believed in all the old peasant animistic ideas. The official Church was called on to define its creed; and for two centuries it continued to seek a Via Media, until at length there was no longer a Catholic Church, but schism or "splitting apart," which left six or seven Churches, each arrogating to itself the ancient title, and denying it to the rest. The Church was dragged down to the level of the masses. Its priests were, as a rule, neither better educated nor more spiritual that their flocks. They sprang from the people, and shared its ideas; and, when the empire was overrun by Goths and Vandals, the ancient civilisation died out, and the Church offices were filled by ignorant and degraded nominees of the State.

Official religion became mainly a question of dogmas and rites, of vestments and money. The sudden change is shown by the numerous Christian inscriptions of Syria, which begin immediately after 325 A.D. They are marked by the cross, and they testify to the growing organisation under metropolitans and archimandrites, and to the increasing power and pride of bishops, who soon claimed to be the representatives of God on earth, or, as the Emperor Charles the Bald called them, in 876 A.D., "the thrones of God in which God sitteth." Stately basilicas rose at once, not only in Rome, but at Jerusalem over the cave of the Venus temple, and at Bethlehem over the cave which Justin Martyr and Origen believed to have been the stable of the Nativity, but which Constantine found in use as a temple of Adonis.[1] As late as 515 A.D. we find a church of St. George at Zorava built on the site of a temple of Theandrites,[2] and others occur at Gerasa and Baalbek, just as the basilica of St. Clement at Rome covers an ancient cave of Mithra.[3] Paganism did not die out at once, nor did Gnosticism.

Theandrites had still a temple in 394 A.D., and a new shrine to Aumo was erected as late as 320 A.D. But

[1] A Greek text at Gerasa (see my "Palestine," 1889, p. 181) commemorates the conversion of a temple into a church. The same is found to have happened in Rome, as recorded in texts after 408 A.D. See Gregorovius, "History of the City of Rome," English trans., 1894, i. p. 74, and Renan, "Marc Aurèle," 1882, p. 578, quoting de Rossi for the Mithræum of St. Clement.

[2] Waddington, "Inscript. Grecques et Latines de la Syrie," 1870, Nos. 2498, 2558, 2046, 2393; Psalm quotations, Nos. 2391, 2413*a*, 2551*c*, 2648, 2650–2654, 2661, 2672–2677.

[3] Perhaps the oldest known Christian building in the world is the synagogue of the Marcionites at Lebaba (*Deir 'Aly*) thirty miles south of Damascus, with a text of 318 A.D.: "The synagogue of the Marcionites of the village Lebaba, to the Lord and Saviour Jesus the Good, by the care of Paul the presbyter. Year 630" (of the Seleucidæ).

the signs of the fish and the cross now mark Christian texts, and quotations from the Psalms are written over the doors of churches and of private houses alike.

All the great men of the fourth century deplored the degradation of the newly established Church.[1] Gregory of Nyssa, about 370 A.D., was indignant at the follies and scandals of the pilgrims. The other Gregory published in verse a diatribe against the bishops as hypocrites, ignorant illiterate peasants, deserters, and timeservers. Chrysostom draws a gloomy picture of the worldliness and superstition of Antioch, of the use of the gospels as amulets, and of Jew hatred, and the fear and savage punishment of witchcraft. He compared the Church to a "faded beauty," seeking to restore her charms with cosmetics. He condemned the growing worship of saints and angels, and the evil lives of "subintroduced sisters." He was utilised as a popular Patriarch, and then flung aside to die in the deserts of Armenia in 407 A.D.

Jerome has drawn a well-known picture of the manners of fashionable prelates in Rome. He had been encouraged in his great work of translating the Bible into Latin by Pope Damasus, but after his death in 384 A.D. the Dalmatian monk, so much hated by his Roman rivals, retired to Bethlehem, where the pious Paula, and her devotee daughter Eustochium, joined him. Paula died in 404, and Jerome, after suffering from the controversies of the age, passed away in 420 A.D., leaving a noble monument of learning behind him. He says[2] that Paula witnessed strange

[1] Stanley, "Christian Instit." 1881, pp. 305–312. Chrysostom, "Hom." (on 1 Corinthians) xxxvi. 5. Dean Spence-Jones, "The Golden Age of the Church," 1906, p. 39.

[2] Jerome, "Pilgrimage of Paula" (Pal. Pil. Text Soc. 1887, p. 13). "Paula and Eustochium" (same series), pp. 10–13.

scenes at Samaria, visiting the supposed tomb of John the Baptist. "For she beheld demons roaring in various torments; and, before the sepulchres of the saints, men who howled like wolves, barked with the voices of dogs, roared with those of lions, hissed like serpents, bellowed like bulls; while others turned round their heads and touched the ground behind their backs with the crown of their heads, and women hung by their feet with their clothes flowing over their faces. She pitied them all, and having shed tears for each, begged the mercy of Christ." It was an exhibition of hypnotism such as has been witnessed at revival meetings in all ages, or in French hospitals of modern times. She went on, "forgetful of her sex and of the weakness of her frame, desiring to dwell with her maidens among so many thousands of monks."

Writing for Paula in his own characteristic style, Jerome further says: "Indeed, the company of monks and nuns is a flower, and a jewel of great price, among the ornaments of the Church. The first men in Gaul hasten hither. The Briton separated from our world, if he has made any progress in religion, leaves the setting sun and seeks a place known to him only by fame and Scripture narratives." "Behold in this little nook the Founder of the heavens was born." "This place I conceive is holier than the Tarpeian Rock." "Read the Revelation of John, and consider what he says of the scarlet woman, and the blasphemies written on her brow; of the seven hills; of the many waters; of the fall of Babylon." "There is the Holy Church . . . but worldliness, authority, the life of a great city, meetings, and exchanges of salutations, praise and blame of one another, listening to others or talking to them, or even against one's will beholding so great a congregation of people, is foreign to the ideal set before monks in their quiet seclusion; for if we see

those who visit us we lose our quiet, and if we do not see them we are accused of pride. Sometimes also, that we may return the calls of our visitors, we proceed to the doors of proud houses, and amid the sneering remarks of the servants, enter their gilded portals." Such was Jerome's experience of Rome under Damasus, which led him to be the first to condemn the "Scarlet Woman," as roundly as Wyclif or any later Puritan. Pilgrimage was no new custom. It was a widely spread and ancient practice in Egypt, India, Mexico, as well as among Greeks and Latins; but the sites now visited were in Palestine; and the relics, footprints, fragments of the cross, and holy places, grew ever more numerous after 330 A.D. The Lupercalia was still celebrated down to the end of the fifth century in Rome, though transformed into a feast of the Purification of Mary; and the cave of Faunus, and of the Roman she-wolf, was dedicated to Saint Stephen.[1]

The Church perhaps was not to be blamed in its attempts to deal with the superstitions of the converts; but her policy was fatal to pure Christianity. Gregory of Nyssa says of Gregory the Wonderworker[2]: "Having observed that the childish and uneducated masses were held fast to idolatry by bodily delights: in order that the main principle—the habit of looking to God rather than to the vain objects of worship—might be established in them, he suffered them to delight themselves in the memorials of the holy martyrs, and to make merry and exult, thinking that their life would gradually be changed into a more virtuous and scrupulous pattern." But he was wrong. Nocturnal orgies at the tombs of saints and martyrs became a scandal, and the worship of Bacchus and

[1] Gregorovius, English trans. i. p. 262.

[2] Gregory of Nyssa, vol. iii. (see Bigg, "The Church's Task," 1905, p. 84).

Venus was thinly veiled by pretended Christianity. Chrysostom at Constantinople, condemned; Ambrose, at Milan, suppressed these festivals, and the dances round sepulchres of saints. Augustin at Hippo spoke of revels and drunkenness at such meetings: for the Agapæ, forbidden in churches, were held in cemeteries, and women were forbidden to pass the night in them in the seventh century.[1] But the same policy of persuasion—and of salving conscience—was pursued in other matters much later. Gregory the Great,[2] about 600 A.D., writing to the abbot Millitus when on a mission to England, defends such a policy on the ground that perfection is only to be attained step by step. Idols are to be destroyed, but not the temples—or stone circles—where they were adored. "Let holy water be made, and sprinkled over them. Let altars be constructed, and relics placed on them; insomuch as these temples are well made it is necessary that they should be converted from the worship of demons to the service of the true God; so that the people, seeing that their temples are not destroyed, may put away error from their hearts, and acknowledge the true God, and, adoring Him, may the more willingly assemble in the places where they are accustomed to meet." It is for this reason that we find crosses cut on old menhir stones, and dolmens in churchyards and crypts. The same was done in Egypt, where the old temples were used as churches very early. But as we have seen, this led to confusion between the worship of Serapis and that of Christ.

The question of allowing images and pictures was treated in like manner. In the fourth century, and

[1] Lundy, "Monumental Christianity," 1876, p. 355.

[2] Gregory I., Epist. xi. 76; Bede, "Hist. Eccles." i. 30. The word "church," though said (see Skeat, *Dict. s.v.*) to come from *Kuriake* ("of the Lord"), is held to be more probably from *Kerk*, "a circle."

down to a later date than 431 A.D., no decorations of the kind were allowed in churches. Only the cross was to be painted on the walls. The Fathers were unanimous, down to Augustin of Hippo, in forbidding images. The Iconoclasts at Constantinople made the last attempt to prevent idolatry and to reform the Eastern Church. They strove for more than a century (730 to 842 A.D.), but popular superstition was too strong for them. Gregory the Great took the side of the masses,[1] and thought that pictures and statues, which had already appeared in the basilica at Ravenna in the fifth century, were allowable—"not for adoration, but as the only means of instructing the minds of the ignorant." John of Damascus who, as el Mansūr, had been an official of the Khalif, died as a monk, in in 756, or later, at Mar Saba, south of Jerusalem, where his tomb still exists, and where he wrote the hymn "Art thou weary?" He composed three orations against those who rejected the holy "icons," and he demanded the right of "worshipping, kissing, and embracing the image both with lips and heart" as a likeness of the Incarnate God, or of His mother, or the saints. Leo the Isaurian,[2] in 726, had decreed that none might kiss the images. The Empress Theodora finally restored them in 842; and the Greek Church allowed pictures but forbade statues in future, while the Popes allowed both. Thus you may perhaps still see the ancient fresco of the Madonna which, half a century ago, was to be found on a pier of the north aisle of the Cathedral at Sorrento—black with the kisses of generations of peasants who believed in its wonder-working powers.

The dogmas of the Church developed slowly after its establishment, and its rites and symbols became more numerous, and differed in East and West until

[1] Gregory I., "Epist." ix. 9; John of Damascus, "Orat." ii. 10.

[2] See Smith's "Dict. Christian Antiq." 1875, *s.v.* Images.

Rome presented a distinct variety, or even species, of Christianity, as compared with Eastern Churches. The Arians and Catholics were also at first pretty evenly matched in numbers, as Athanasius learned to his cost by twenty years of exile. They were obliged to combine in opposing the reactionary paganism of Julian, but not until the accession of the fanatical Spanish emperor, Theodosius (in 379 A.D.), was the cause of Arius lost at Constantinople. In 787 the Greeks and Romans decided in favour of images, and held their last council together, all the Asiatic Churches having seceded already between 431 and 680 A.D.

The question of Easter, that of the use of unleavened bread, and that of a peculiar tonsure, seem of themselves to be small causes of rupture; but they were connected with each other, and with important questions of belief, such as the dogmas newly introduced by Rome concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the temporary pains of Purgatory. The East had always followed the fourth gospel in believing that Jesus was crucified on the day of the Passover. The West followed the other three gospels in believing that the Last Supper was the Passover, and they consequently used unleavened bread, while the Greeks used leavened. When Augustin was sent as a missionary to the pagan Saxons, he found a British Church celebrating the Greek Easter and using the Greek tonsure. It must have been an offshoot of the Church of Lyons founded by Irenæus, who was a Greek. But Augustin cannot have been the first Latin missionary in England, if the ancient basilica at Silchester was a church, and not a civil building of Romans, before 400 A.D.; for here, two centuries before Augustin was sent from Rome, we find the apse on the west—as in Roman basilicas—and not on the east, as it nearly always was in Asia.

The new missionary made no concessions; for though weak Churches seek union, as the Greeks and Romans did in times of trouble, strong Churches love independence. The power of the Roman Church, even when oppressed, was due to the zeal of her first missionaries, who carried the Catholic faith to south Britain, in the fourth century or earlier, and thence to Ireland and Scotland, while in the eighth century Boniface, from England, extended her sway over Germany, though the Prussians remained pagans even in the thirteenth century.

The increasingly wide belief in the divinity of Jesus naturally led to the adoration of His mother, as the Virgin Mother of God, in the fifth century, after the expulsion of Nestorius, who refused her that title. New apocryphal gospels were then written, based sometimes on earlier works, transferring to Christ the legends of Buddha and of Krishna, and those of Maya, and Devaki, to Mary. Paganism still survived, though it was put down by Theodosius in 388. It was transformed, by the policy of the Church, in East and West alike. The ancient belief in sacred footprints, in relics such as Leda's egg, in ex-votos hung up in temples, which we find in Pausanias, was changed but yet the same. The cross itself was an ancient emblem of "life" in Babylonia, hung to the necks of kings. The Missa, or "Mass," took its name either from the Aryan word for a cake, or from the Hebrew Massoth or unleavened bread. In the fourth century, the birthday of Mithra, "the unconquered sun," was celebrated in Rome as the birthday of Christ, on December 25; but Chrysostom regarded it as a new custom, unknown in Antioch. Relics began to be adored in the fourth century. Bells were then introduced in the West, and the earliest liturgies belong to the same age. In the fifth century incense and lights were first used by Christians, and the

crucifix began to be known in the West: in the sixth, sacerdotal vestments began to be distinguishable by the survival of ancient patrician and sacred robes; holy water was used, and miraculous images were adored. In the seventh century the Host or "Victim" was worshipped; in the eighth elaborate processions, like those of the pagans, became usual; in the ninth the mitre was adopted—the ancient headdress of Persian Magi—with the crozier, which was like the old lituus of the augurs. By the twelfth century Latin rites differed greatly from those of the East, where most bishops wore crowns, and where the swinging censer, the crucifix, and the font were unknown—baptism being by immersion, as it still is. The table of the Supper became an altar, even in the third century, when the Eucharist was separated from the Agape. But in the dark ages it was consecrated by the presence of a relic.

Celibacy of the clergy was also a custom which distinguished the Roman Church from all others after 443 A.D. We have epitaphs of a Roman married deacon dating 295 A.D., of a married Roman priest in 389, and of a "Levite's wife" even as late as 472 A.D. The Council of Elvira, in 305, had vainly attempted to introduce celibacy; and Leo the Great permitted priests already married to keep their wives. Gregory the Great (about 600 A.D.) forbade such marriages, and Hildebrand, in the latter part of the eleventh century, waged war on the married clergy; but though asceticism thus prevailed in the West, all the ancient evils relating to "sub-introduced sisters" were thus perpetuated.

iii. **Mediæval.**—The separation of the Greeks and Romans began in Charlemagne's time, about 774 A.D., and the Western Church—rescued from the Lombards—crowned him emperor in 800 A.D. Leo the Great, in

452, had taken a leading position in Italy when he negotiated with Attila. Gregory the Great in 590 was the first to extend the power of the Roman bishop beyond the borders of the peninsula; and already, by 742, the "pallium" was received by bishops of Great Britain and Germany from the Pope. As the German empire became weak the power of the Pontiff increased, and John VIII. in 872 claimed the right to choose the emperor. The quarrel between Germany and Italy, between sacerdotal and civil power, between the Latin and the Teutonic races then began, and in spite of many vicissitudes it never was settled until the two opposing principles—the authority of the priest-king and the liberty of the people—led to the final breach at the Reformation. Leo IX. excommunicated the Greek Patriarch in 1054, and the schism was rendered more bitter when, during the two centuries of Latin power in Palestine, the Roman bishops usurped the sees of the Greeks, whom they would at most only acknowledge as suffragans. The attempts to dominate Asiatic Churches failed, and only the Maronites finally submitted, giving up their peculiar dogma, but retaining—in return for their submission to the Pope—their married clergy. During the twelve years of Hildebrand's pontificate (1073 to 1085) he contended for two principles: first, that the Pope should not be nominated by the Emperor but elected by the Cardinals; and secondly, that the Empire was a fief of Rome. By his alliance with the Countess Matilda and the Normans, he forced Henry IV. to do penance at Canossa; and in 1122 Henry V. agreed to a compromise with Calixtus II., whereby bishops held their sees from the Pope, and their temporal possessions from the Emperor. Hildebrand was the true founder of feudal Papacy, which was further strengthened when Urban II. aided Peter the Hermit to rouse Western Europe for the redemption

of Palestine from the Turk. Hildebrand had been the first to propose a Crusade, and the first to use the terrible weapon of the interdict on a great scale. Urban was the first to offer indulgences—which were considered "new" and "dangerous" in 747 A.D.—to those who took the Cross, and to claim the power to remit (for money paid or service rendered) the inevitable results of Conduct, over which no man has control, and which India had recognised for more than a thousand years as eternally fatal. During the twelfth century the Papal tyranny reached its culmination, and Innocent III. (1198–1216) set himself above all laws, as the feudal head of Europe, to whom King John submitted in England. He imposed the dogma of Transubstantiation on the Church, and founded the terrible Inquisition. But Urban II. did not know that he was the agent of an Eternal Purpose which was sending fresh light from the East; and Innocent III. did not know that the Universities of the thirteenth century would, in time, deal the death-blow to feudalism and sacerdotal supremacy. The ruined empire of Constantinople sought union with the West under Michael Palæologus in 1278, but his son dissolved the alliance three years later. With the fall of Acre in 1292 the real power of the Papacy began to decay, though it maintained a hollow appearance of supremacy. From 1060 to 1300 this power lay in the appeal from a native bishop to Rome; but the Popes at Avignon (1305 to 1378) had little real authority, and immediately after the return of Gregory XI. to Rome, the great schism broke out, lasting till 1418 A.D. John Palæologus (1425 to 1448) made a last attempt to reconcile the Latins and Greeks; but the fall of Constantinople in 1453 put an end to all such negotiations between a discredited Papacy and a ruined Greek empire.

Orders of monks were unknown in the fourth

century, though Eastern ascetics followed the "rule of St. Basil," after 358 A.D., and Westerns that of St. Benedict, after about 529 A.D. The four new orders of the West appeared in the thirteenth century, and were used by the Popes to control the power of foreign bishops. The Dominicans, or black monks, were organised in 1216; the Minorites, or "little brothers of the poor," were founded by Francis of Assisi seven years later, and known as "grey friars." The White Carmelites belong to the same age, with the "pyed monks," or Augustinians, wearing black and white. Francis of Assisi was a true Christian and a brave man. In 1218 he went to Egypt to convert the Sultan Melek el Kamil, who listened to his preaching, and sent him safely away. But in 1226 he died, disappointed by the development of the order he created; and, though they showed much devotion in Palestine, and were sent by the Pope in 1232 to convert Melek el Ashraf of Damascus, and the Sultan of Iconium, yet the first enthusiasm soon died out, and by the middle of the fourteenth century all the great orders had begun to decay, and the rich monasteries became the homes of superstition, sloth, and ignorance, in too many cases. Temporal power always depended on wealth and possession of lands. The Emperor Valentinian had forbidden Pope Damasus to receive legacies, though the Church already held property under Constantine. Donations were often made of unoccupied lands, and at the close of the twelfth century the Church held half the land in England, and an even larger proportion on the Continent. Charlemagne's concessions placed the clergy beyond the civil laws of his rude empire, and they gradually absorbed all the professions, and much of the trade of their countries; the "remonstrance of the English," in the middle of the thirteenth century, urged that Italian priests were drawing, in tithes and

dues, far more money than the total of the royal revenue.

Such was the world on which the monk of Malvern looked out when he wrote his "Vision of Piers Ploughman." Satires on the clergy are traced back as early as the twelfth century.[1] Chaucer's wit played round the worldly abbess, the pardoners, and summoners, and the "loller" or "luller,"[2] singing hymns in the street as in the age of Celsus. But Langland (if that was his name) goes deeper, and asks the remedy for the evils of his time. He draws the picture of rapacious nobles and tyrannous prelates, of corruption at court, fraud in trade, ignorance and drunkenness among peasants—sins scourged by the great pestilences of 1348 and 1361, and by the mighty wind of 1362 A.D. He tells us of bishops as chancellors spending money on jesters and not on the poor, keeping hounds and riding on expensive palfreys. He denounces the priests for their simony: the paid confessors, the sale of masses, clerical immorality and pride, recalling the words of Saint Augustin. He speaks of the four orders of monks, of their wealth and political power, their greed, their hypocrisy, their sins, and their intrusion into houses and family life. He describes the pardoner with his bulls, the limitor licensed to beg within certain limits, the hermits—not like those of old—the palmer with false relics, the pilgrimages to Rome, to Compostella, Walsingham, Bromholm, or Chester, and the wonder-working roods at the English shrines. Then he turns to the simplicity of Christ, and to Piers Ploughman—human nature glorified at length as the humanity of Jesus. In Piers Ploughman's Creed (whoever wrote it) we find the four orders denouncing each other—the Grey Friars (Franciscans), the Black Dominicans, White

[1] Jusserand, "Literary History of the English People," 1895, p. 178.
[2] Chaucer, "Shipman's Prologue," 1173, 1177.

Carmelites, and "Freres of the Pye," all equally ignorant and greedy.

> "Wytnes on Wyclif
> That warned hem with treuthe."[1]

Wyclif was supported by king, nobles, and commons, alike disgusted with the Roman Church, when the Reformation was born at Oxford in 1360, and declared heresy at St. Paul's in 1377. He thus escaped the "bishop's prison"; and the priests were reduced to the poor revenge of burning his bones thirty years after his death. To him the Pope was Antichrist,[2] and the King the true head of the Church of England. He refused tribute to Rome, denied transubstantiation, denounced pardons, indulgences, absolutions, pilgrimages, the worship of images and saints; but he spoke of "the sinful city of Avignon," like the British Parliament—the "good Parliament" of 1376. He wrote bad Latin; but he and his students produced, in nervous English, our first complete Bible in the vulgar tongue. Men could now read for themselves the words of Jesus—"Love your enemies," in an age of war; "Judge not," in an age when men were being burned for their faith; "Call no man father," when every celibate priest or monk demanded the title. They saw—and never forgot—that the teaching of their Lord was not that of a corrupted Church. The bold words of Wyclif were studied by Johann Hus in

[1] Wright, "Vision and Creed of Piers Ploughman," 1856, ii. p. 482; "Creed," 1051.

[2] Wyclif's twelve reasons were: (1) Christ is truth, the Pope false; (2) the Pope is rich; (3) proud; (4) has added cruel laws; (5) does not "go and preach," but sits in a palace; (6) loves temporal power; (7) opposes Cæsar; (8) makes twelve cardinals instead of disciples; (9) makes wars; (10) intrudes in other countries; (11) loves pomp instead of humility; (12) seeks fame and gold. He is, therefore, in all respects, the reverse of Christ, and is thus Antichrist.—Creighton, "The Papacy," 1892, I. p. 106.

1391, and he became Rector of the University of Prague in 1409. Thus, as England had christianised Germany in the eighth century, she made Bohemia Protestant in the fifteenth. The memory of Wyclif was kept alive by the poor "lullers" or "lollards"—street "singers" and preachers—for more than a century. The treacherous surrender of Hus to his foes at Constance, in 1415, rang the knell of Papal supremacy; and the German Reformation sprang from his ashes.

iv. Modern.—Pope Leo X. was highly cultivated, but he was not a great man. He failed to read the signs of the times, and mistook revolution for a mere quarrel between a Dominican and an Augustinian monk. He was the second son of Lorenzo de Medici, and became a cardinal at the age of thirteen.[1] He inherited the love of art and philosophy of the great house from which he sprang, but his extravagance ruined the Church. He was fond of hunting and fowling, and of quiet games of chess and cards with other cardinals. He represents the better side of the Renaissance, and great hopes were felt when he became Pope in 1513. He caused the Psalms to be translated into four languages, and even permitted the issue of the translation of the New Testament by Erasmus. The two Borgia Popes, Alphonso (or Calixtus III.), and his nephew, Roderigo (Alexander VI.), had represented the savage side of the Renaissance movement. The latter was accused of gaining his election by bribes; and the unscrupulous violence of his son Cæsar may be judged by the history of Catherine Sforza. Savonarola was burned during the Papacy of Alexander VI., and the Italian

[1] See Roscoe, "Life and Pontificate of Leo X.," 1846; Buckley, "History of the Council of Trent," 1852; Froude, "Life and Letters of Erasmus," 1894.

Reformation was stamped out. Leo X. failed to unite Europe against the Turks, and his bull was burned in 1520 by Luther, as that of John XXIII. had been, more than a century earlier by Hus. He failed to appreciate Luther's warning: "In these our days Germany flourishes in erudition, reason, and genius"; or, even if he understood, he may have been powerless to control the Curia; and Luther was probably quite in earnest when he compared Leo to Daniel in the den of lions. In 1517 Cardinal Petrucci and others were tried for attempting to poison the Pope, and Leo X. actually died of poison on December 1, 1521.

The condition of Italy, and of the Roman Church, in this age was described about a century later by the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmino. "A few years before the heresies of Luther and Calvin there was, according to the testimony of contemporary writers, neither justice in the ecclesiastical courts, nor discipline in the morals of the clergy, nor knowledge of sacred things, nor respect for holy things: in short, there was scarcely any religion left." Leo X. did much to aid the spread of learning and the use of printing; but the recovery of the classics seemed about to restore paganism. Pontano Sanazzaro, and other Latin writers of the age, introduced pagan mythology into sacred subjects, as Tasso had done earlier. Marullus wrote hymns full of fervour in honour of the gods of Greece and Rome. Plato's reference to the good man crucified was applied to Christ. Prierio said that the Bible owed its authority to the Pope. The tyranny and rapacity of the clergy, and their interference with private life, their intrusion into houses, and their use of the confessional, roused general indignation. But the tolerance of concubines was perhaps the greatest cause of popular disgust. Leo X., writing to Ferdinand of Aragon in favour of Innocenzio Cibo, recommended him to be made a

cardinal, as being "the son of my sister, and the grandson of Pope Innocent VIII." One of the complaints to be found in the "Centum Gravamina" of 1532 was the exaction of the tax on concubines, levied on priests who had none, on the plea that they could keep them if they chose.[1] Voltaire gives the tariff of 1514, printed at Rome by order of Leo X., and called the "Taxes of the Holy and Apostolic Chancery and Penitentiary," the Paris edition being a quarto of 1520. It includes absolution for revealing confessions of a penitent, and for the priest who keeps a concubine. The work was placed on the Index Expurgatorius by the Council of Trent, on the plea that it had been corrupted by heretics. But of the existence of such a tax there seems to be no doubt, and a similar tariff of absolution was promulgated in France in 1691 A.D.

The foundation of the new Cathedral of St. Peter in Rome, and the enlargement and beautifying of the Vatican, entailed an enormous expenditure in the time of Leo X. The Church was certainly unfortunate in sending a mountebank like Tetzel to collect money in Germany by the sale of the new indulgences. Luther asked, "Why does not the Pope, out of his most holy charity, empty Purgatory, in which are so many souls in punishment? This would be a worthier exercise of his power than freeing souls for money—this money brings misfortune—and to put to what use? To build a church." "This pains me and turns me sick. . . . They fancy their

[1] The political object of Hildebrand in enforcing celibacy, while concubines were allowed, appears to have been to prevent the growth of a hereditary priesthood. A Council of Toledo recognised the concubine if there was no wife, and if the communicant remained faithful to one woman (Lecky, "European Morals" (11th edit.), ii. pp. 330, 350, note 2). The concubine by Roman, as by Babylonian law, was recognised as an inferior wife—a freed woman marrying a free man.

souls will be delivered from Purgatory as soon as the money clinks in the coffer." But Luther was denounced by the emperor, Charles V., as, "not a man, but Satan himself." Leo was perhaps as helpless to control the conduct of a greedy prelacy as any Sultan, Czar, or Dalai Lama, who has become a mere figurehead controlled by others. But Charles V. found that, unless he tolerated the Protestants, his empire would in the end fall to the Turks. The spread of the new learning, the printing of the Bible, and the follies of Tetzel, together tended to set free nations who would not tolerate the old idea that the provinces should be taxed in order that Italy might have the monopoly of power and wealth. The study of Hebrew and Greek was looked upon with growing suspicion by the Curia. Reuchlin's "Rudimenta Hebraica" was published in 1506, and he was summoned before the Inquisition at Mentz, and in great danger of being burnt as a Judaiser. Leo X. stopped the proceedings, however, in 1516 A.D. In 1513 the New Testament of Erasmus was published, with its severe notes and prefaces concerning monks and bishops, and its attack on the pedantry of the schoolmen.

Erasmus was the wonder and delight of Europe, on account of his learning and wit. The new study of Greek was then as little known as is the study of cuneiform to-day. Princes welcomed the great scholar, who was finally buried in state in the cathedral at Bâle in 1536 A.D. But the knowledge of the world which he thus attained rendered Erasmus—who desired reformation and not revolution—unwilling to aid in producing a schism, though also unwilling to condemn Luther, whom he regarded as a good man. He hesitated, and was only persuaded to embark in a barren controversy concerning Free Will, in which he took the view of Aristotle, while Luther cited

Paul's spiritual struggles—for neither could find the theory in the Bible, which speaks only of the Will of God. "The world," says Erasmus, "cannot overcome the world." Yes; but the world could overcome Erasmus, and it could not overcome Luther. We may regret his speaking of his opponent as an "exasperated viper" in 1524, but we must all admire the sincerity of his great defence at Worms three years before. "I cannot submit my faith either to Pope or Councils, since it is as clear as day that they have often fallen into error, and even into great contradictions with themselves. If, then, I am not convinced by testimonies of Scripture, or by evident reasons; if I am not persuaded by the very passages I have cited; and if my conscience is not made captive by the Word of God, I can and will retract nothing. For it is not safe for a Christian to speak against his conscience." And then—breaking into his native German from the Latin—"Here stand I. I can no other. God help me. Amen."

Luther died early in 1546, having lived to see the Council he desired convened; but it was not attended by any Protestant or any Oriental Church. It was solely Roman Catholic; and, after dragging on at Trent and elsewhere under eight Popes for nineteen years, it failed to reform the Church, or to secure reunion. Don Francisco Vargos—a good Catholic—said: "Words and persuasions do signify but little in this place, and I suppose are not of much greater force at Rome, these people having shut their eyes with a resolution, notwithstanding all things should go rack, not to understand anything that does not suit with their interests." The decisions of this Council were not to be interpreted without Papal authority, and, as embodied in the Creed of Pius IV., they finally separated the Roman Church from all others. For the proud boast, "Quod semper, quod

ubique, quod ab omnibus," had been examined by those learned in the Fathers; and "always" was found to mean only two centuries and a half; "everywhere" only the south-west of Europe; and "by all" a minority which, in our own times, nominally represents about ten per cent. of mankind.

From Germany the Reformation spread again to its original birthplace in England. It is true that Henry VIII. utilised the public opinion of the day for his own ends, and enriched his courtiers with the spoil of the monasteries. It is no doubt true that the bishop of Reformation times was not unlike his predecessors under the Popes. But the true Reformation was not brought about by king or bishop: it spread among the respectable classes of the country in consequence of Bible-reading at home. To the end of his life Henry persecuted those who denied the six articles—transubstantiation, the refusal of the cup to the laity, celibacy of the clergy, vows of chastity, private masses, and confession to a priest. In 1530 he issued a proclamation against heretical books. The "kynges hignes *(sic)* by his incomparable wysedome," decided that none should "kepe or have the newe testament or the olde in the englisshe tonge, or in the frenche or duche tonge, excepte suche persones as be appoynted by the kinges highnes, and the bisshops of this his realme, for the correction or amending of the said translation." Seven years later, after the monasteries had been dissolved and the wonder-working roods destroyed, Henry sanctioned the first licensed version, by John Rogers, who became the first martyr burned by Mary.[1]

The marginal notes of this version (published under the assumed name of Thomas Matthew) are very

[1] Rogers completed the work of Tyndale and Coverdale, which Henry VIII. forbade to be read. His notes were crossed out by order of Parliament, as is still to be seen in the copy here used.

remarkable, not only for their learning, and boldness on points not touching the six articles, but also for their total silence on the institution of the Lord's Supper. Rogers quotes Hebrew and Greek and Chaldee, and refers to the works of Josephus, Augustin, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Ambrose: also to Rabbi Kimhi and Ibn Ezra, to Pliny, Strabo, Macrobius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilarius, Frontonius, Eusebius, and Theophilactus. But above all, his great modern authority is Erasmus. He says (on Isaiah iii.): "Now priests, and such as falsely boast themselves to be spiritual, are justly called 'exactors,' inasmuch as they require these rights (as they call them) more by men's tradition than by the Word of God, and do not so seek souls to God as money for themselves." "Whether children be christened, or marriages made, or men come to the table of the Lord; whether the sick be visited, or the dead buried, there is ever somewhat required." Still more curious is the note in Ezekiel (xviii.): "Sophisters say God forgives the sin but not the punishment." "By this sophistry might the King give a man pardon for theft, and after hang him up. For he might say, Sir, I forgave you your theft but not your hanging, which is due to your theft. Such pardon would they be loth to have that first imagined it." "But hereof will I now speak no more, lest ye should haply smell that this solution were imagined to pick men's purses, through mass pence, dirige-groats, etc." Again, on Matthew (xxiii.): "And even now haply must a bishop be heard that doth truly teach the Gospel, though he live skant Gospel-like. But who can suffer them, against Christ's doctrine, for their own profits, to make and unmake laws, exercising on the people plain tyranny, and measuring all things for their own advantage and authority? They that, with traditions imagined for their own lucre and tyranny, do

hamper the people, do not sit in the chair of the Gospel, but in the chair of Simon Magus, and Caiaphas. These are the very words of Erasmus on this place." Finally, in the first epistle of Timothy (ii.), a bishop is defined as an overseer: "which when he desireth to feed Christ's flock with the food of health—that is, with His holy word, as the bishops did in Paul's time—desireth a good work, and the very office of a bishop. But he that desireth honours, gapeth for lucre, trusteth great rents, seeketh pre-eminence, pomp, dominion, coveteth abundance of all things, without want; rest and heartsease—castles, parks, lordships, earldoms—desireth not a work, much less a good work, and is nothing less than a bishop as St. Paul here understandeth a bishop."

The great compromises of Elizabeth, which satisfied England till recently, did not satisfy Scotland. She may have been well advised to refuse permission to Knox to enter her kingdom; and Calvin, the teacher of the great Scotsman, cannot be called a true Christian when we remember Servetus; but the Scottish mind was ever more serious and logical than that of the English, and their Reformation was therefore more complete. The statecraft of Elizabeth, however, shielded the Protestantism of north and south alike, while in France the anti-German policy of kings, and the rule of the great cardinals, led to the ruin of the Huguenot cause. What our forefathers thought of their Reformation we learn from that strange, repulsive work which, in the time of Elizabeth, was read in every home, and chained beside the chained Bibles in the churches.[1] It tells us how the movement against ancient superstitions began among the people before Henry VIII. quarrelled with the Pope about his divorce—as in the story of the "Rood of

[1] John Foxe, "Acts and Monuments of Martyrs," Revised Edition, 1597, pp. 940, 1949.

Dovercourt" in Suffolk, destroyed by poor youths, of whom three were hanged in chains in 1532. "For at that time there was a great roumour blown abroad amongst the ignorant folke, that the power of the idoll of Dovercourt was so great that no man had power to shut the church door." So, finding it open, "they tooke the idoll from his shrine, and carried him a quarter of a mile from the place where he stood, without any resistance of the said idoll. Whereupon they strake fire with a flint stone, and sodainly set him on fire, who burned out so brim that he lighted them homeward one good mile of the ten." The belief of the nation is symbolised by the rude cut in the same work, showing Truth with bandaged eyes holding the balance. On the one side it is weighed down by the Word of God watched by apostles and prophets: the other scale flies up, though popes and bishops pour into it their rosaries and crosses, wafers and triple crown, while the devil, with his wings, horns, hoofs, and tail complete, hangs on beneath. The axe fell on the short neck of Laud because he desired to go back to the Church of Henry VIII., and did not understand the temper of the English, and still less of the Scottish people.

One final feature of the great changes thus brought about was new to Christianity, but ancient in Asia—the institution of the Order of Jesuits, whose founder was Ignatius Loyola. The Church of Rome, having lost its power, was forced to rely on persuasion and diplomacy. Secret societies we find in all ages, and in all countries; but until the bull of 1540 they had been more characteristic of later Moslems than of Christians. The idea of absolute obedience to a superior was put into practice by the Assassins, and continues still among the Dervishes. Loyola had travelled in Palestine, and may have known something of the power of such sects. More probably

he recalled the Templars of the thirteenth century; but they also had been influenced by Moslems. The new Order, in addition to the ordinary vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, took a fourth vow, of devotion to the Pope. The Institutes suggested were disapproved by Pope Paul III. in 1523, before Loyola set out for Jerusalem. Five years later he was imprisoned by the Inquisition. With Lainez and others he founded the famous Order on August 15, 1534, but the numbers were restricted to sixty at first—a restriction only removed by the second bull of 1543, or shortly before the Assembly of the Council of Trent. The Popes appear to have looked with suspicion on the movement, though Lainez as general of the Order took part in the Council, and Jesuit missionaries were employed in England by Gregory XIII. in 1580. The Jesuits at first appear to have encouraged the Freemasons, whose Grand Lodge at York was broken up by Elizabeth in 1561, but they became declared enemies of this secret fraternity when it was supposed to fall into the hands of Deists. In the old age of Louis XIV. Madame de Maintenon favoured the Order, and their power was shown by Le Tellier's destruction of Port Royal in 1709. The first blow to it was, however, struck at Blenheim five years earlier. In 1719 Madame de Maintenon died; but the Order continued its persecution of Jansenists and Protestants, till they found an enemy in Madame de Pompadour. The French Parliament decreed their expulsion in 1762, and Madame de Pompadour died of poison in the year of final confiscation, her body being removed from the palace in a wheelbarrow on April 14, 1764. General expulsions followed in Spain, Portugal, and Naples, and the Order was suppressed by Clement XIV. on July 21, 1773, after escaping in 1769, on account of the death of Clement XIII. on the very night when he was to have signed the decree

against them. Voltaire says quite justly that the Jesuits fell through pride.

The Order was not, however, dead, and revived with the reaction following the fall of Napoleon. It was re-established by Pius VII. on August 7, 1814; but it never regained its old power. From the first the Jesuits fought for a lost cause—the re-establishment of Papal supremacy. No amount of learning, ability, or patience suffices to win final success when the general opinion of mankind—based on experience—remains hostile. "Reserve," and "economy of Truth," must always excite suspicion against those who shun the light, and men must always think that a secret purpose is not one tending to the general good. "He who desires the end desires the means"; but we judge the end now by observing what the means are. It is in vain to devote study (as Jesuits now do) to Evolution, and to Cuneiform, if the intention be—not to be led by knowledge of facts, but to reconcile facts to theory. Men of science do not accept a presentation of Evolution as being merely a new statement of the cosmogony of Genesis. Nor do they accept a translation which finds the name of Chedorlaomer in one of 'Ammurabi's letters. The fine-spun diplomacy of the Jesuits was very roughly answered at Sadowa and Sedan. Their careful education of the French army produced only a Boulanger, and resulted in the Dreyfus affair. It has now led to further expulsions. The final success of the Order could only come about if mankind lost its love of freedom. As it is, we now see the two great opposing powers, which were used by the Eternal Purpose in the sixteenth century, become mere ghosts of the past: the Turk losing steadily province after province, and the Roman Church country after country.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

An Eternal Purpose working through the ages is the lesson to be learned from the social history of man. Great as has been the steady advance from the savage to the civilised condition, we must recognise that the history of six thousand years is but the beginning of an evolution which will bring forth yet greater things in the future. Archbishop Temple and Dr. Martineau[1] alike saw that evolution is the new argument of design —a better argument than Paley's, because it deals, not with machines but with living beings. Science is accurate knowledge, and truth is the white light now, as it was to Plato. There must always be a hazy atmosphere of conjecture and imagination surrounding it, and necessary for the further spread of that light; but to this the name of science or knowledge must not be given. The old philosophies were useful in their days, but science supersedes their conjectures by actual discovery. Kant could not be truly informed as to the nature of the mind since, in his time, the structure and functions of the brain were still unknown—hence his paradox proves unsound, when he teaches that we perceive facts by the senses, yet are able to know what the senses do not perceive: an error into which Locke did not fall. Between true science and reasonable faith there is no real conflict,

[1] "Life and Letters of James Martineau," Drummond, 1902, p. 436.

for the one deals with actual experience, and the other trusts the Providence which has never failed in the past to bring good out of evil. It is only between the speculations of those who misuse the term science, and the ancient misconceptions of the past, that any discrepancy occurs.

Our great difficulty lies in our ignorance, and in the very slow acceptance of new facts by the majority, whose ideas are hampered by the influences of ancient methods of education. To the professional class, and to the skilled artisan, science is now a necessity for success in life. The level of attainment is as yet not high, but their education is far in advance of that given to either higher or lower social grades. Dr. Temple no doubt made the best defence possible for the ancient classical teaching, which remains much what it became four centuries ago. The reading of Latin and Greek does, no doubt, give us "intercourse with other minds,"[1] but so does the greater literature which exists in modern languages; and we are not now living in the age when Greek was a new study, or when Latin was the common means of communication between scholars ignorant of continental languages. Many of the prejudices and deficiencies of our governing classes are due to their want of scientific knowledge, and to the inordinate importance attached to classical training, and to physical exercise. A wiser education is the first requisite for further advance of the race.

Below the scientific class a vast mass of semi-educated population has now been created by national education. Civilised, as compared with the brutal mob of two centuries ago, they are yet unable to do much more than to write and read. They are still the prey of impostors as ignorant as themselves, and of a cheap daily press as pretentious as it is ill-

[1] "Frederic Temple," 1906, i. p. 169.

informed. Our first duty to these classes is to provide them with a better education, fitting them for the duties of their lives. The idea of general education is still so recent, that we cannot wonder at the mistakes that have been made in the attempt to apply it to the whole nation. Time and good-will must, however, in the end produce a higher level of understanding, and when we look back even a century we find cause for encouragement in the advance that has been actually made.

Religion still plays the most important part in civilised history, and must always include Faith as well as Ethics. For ethics are the results of human experience, and deal with the present and with this world; but man can never be prevented from seeking to understand the future, and will always need Hope, and Trust, to comfort him in his troubles. Marcus Aurelius is a charming character in history, and his wise sayings on ethical questions remain as true now as when he wrote his twelve short books of "Meditations." But he has not become a master of the world, nor is he ever likely to influence the many, because he deals only with actual experience, and has no steadfast trust as to the future. The "religion of the future," in any age, is the religion of the present among those whose minds are clearest, and whose character stands highest. Whatever may happen in the Far East, we cannot expect that Islam, or Buddhism, or any of the great religions of Asia, will ever have a general influence on the West. The names of Muhammad and of Gautama are not household words to us as they are to the masses in Asia, and the majority of men in civilised Europe know practically nothing about these great leaders of thought in the East. Nor can we expect that any of the existing Christian Churches is destined to triumph over all the rest. They all alike have added something of

their own to the "simplicity of Christ." The Christianity fitted to "overcome the world" cannot be that of the dark ages, or of the stormy days of Reformation. It cannot even be that of the Fathers or of the Apostles, though it will be that of Saint Francis and of Penn. It will be the faith of the Master, the religion of trust in Providence and of good-will to men. It will not concern itself with Greek philosophy, or with the Greek dogma of free will, but only with that consistency which some call the "law of nature," but which—if we believe in one Will directing all—it is better to call by the old name, "the will of God."

We are told that such expectations are unpractical; and that while human nature remains unchanged war and poverty must continue for ever. But this assumes that there has been no change in humanity in the past, which is in direct contradiction to the lessons of history. The Norman baron, no doubt, could not have imagined a time when nobles would not live in castles, wear armour, fight a neighbour twenty miles away to maintain "the right of private war," and tax the trader at every gate or bridge. The abolition of war in the future will not present greater difficulties than the abolition of slavery did a century ago. Those who suppose that war produces hardy virtues have never seen what it is really like; and greater courage is daily shown on our seas, and in our mines, than is needed on the field of battle. As long as man stands face to face with death the need for courage will remain unchanged, however peaceful may be his future existence in a more civilised condition of society. All that is best in our present conditions we owe to the pure Christianity which never quite died out even in the dark ages.

Let us remember then that the world is still young, and that Asia as well as Europe is still advancing to conditions which we can as yet only foresee vaguely,

but which will—as we learn from experience of the past—be higher and better than anything we now know. The ripple of the stream is a mighty wave to those who venture on it in frail cockle-boats to-day, and the swirl of the backwater is often mistaken for the tide. But the Wisdom which we do not understand is the great current, which sweeps us on its breast to shining summer seas. The simple things are the greatest, and our common joys and sorrows are our true discipline. We are surrounded by great mysteries, of which the wisest among us knows no more than the simplest, and by great facts which are entirely unaffected by the babble of men.

INDEX

Aalu, fields of, 164
Abbaside, Khalifs, 130, 131
'Abd-tsadik, King, 252
'Abiri = Hebrews, 93, 251–3
Abu el Faraj, 18
Abyssinians, 54, 125, 127
Acre, city, 135, 139
Æons, 314, 316
Afghans, 67
African languages, 54
Agape Love Feast, 312, 323, 332, 336
Agesilaos, 106
Agglutination, 43
Agnosticism, 6
Agrippa, Cornelius, 16
Ahura-mazdā (Ormuzd), 198–9
Ainos of Japan, 62, 102
Ajalon, 254, 273
Ak = Nebo, 174, 176
Akka dwarfs, 38
Akkadian language, 57–8, 83
— people, 40, 45, 83–4, 267
— religion, 170–78
— texts, 84
Alabaster, 83
Alaric, the Goth, 123
Alchemy, 16
Alcibiades, 106
Alexander the Great, 107, 195
Alfred, King, 136
Algebra, 9, 10
'Ali, the Khalif, 129, 249
Alp Arslan, 132
Alphabets, 66, 69, 71, 86, 99, 121, 130, 258, 268
Amarna Letters, 93, 251–5
Ambrose, bishop, 321, 332
Ambrosia, 200
Amen, the god, 92
Amenophis II., 163
— III. and IV., 92
Amenti or Hades, 166
America, 143–5
American language, 63
— religion, 226–33
Amitabha, 218
'Ammurabi (Amraphel), 87–90 205, 265–7
Amorites, 92
Anahita, goddess, 199, 206
Ancestor worship, 155, 221
Angora, 115, 139, 140
Ani, maxims of, 169
Animism, 150–61
Anquetil Duperron, 23
Ansan in Persia, 83, 98
Anubis, the god, 166
Apes, 19, 47
Apocalypse, 302
Apocryphal Gospels, 315, 317, 335
Apsara nymphs, 240
Arabia, 65
Arabic, 23, 243
Arabs, The, 65, 66, 127–33, 233–47, 276
Aramaic language, 65, 99
Archæology, 22–4
Archimedes, 13
Architecture, 129–31, 137
Arian heresy, 122–3, 334
Arioch (Eriaku), 86, 88
Aristophanes, 13, 106
Aristotle, 17, 18, 107, 195
Arks, 269, 271, 273
Armenians, 68
Art in Italy, 142
Arthur, King, 188
Aryan languages, 39, 47
— race, 37, 45, 46, 67
— religions, 187–91
Asceticism, 216, 303, 312, 336
Asmodeus, demon, 289
Asoka, Emperor, 99, 100, 214–6
Ass, 41, 90
Assassins, the, 248, 350

Assur-bani-pal, 22, 95, 96, 185, 259
Assur-bel-kala, 94
Assur-uballid, 91
Assyria, 88, 90, 94–5, 97
Assyrian language, 24
Astronomy, 10–13, 229–30, 232
Astruc, Jean, 280
'Ataroth, town, 256
Aten, the god, 168
Atheism, 6
Attila, 120, 337
Augustin, 12, 334
Augustus, Emperor, 110
Aurochs, bull, 21
Aurungzebe, Emperor, 144
Ausar = Assyria, 89
Australians, 37, 61, 62
Avalo-kit Isvara, 218
Avignon, Popes at, 142, 338, 341
Azariah, King, 257
Aztecs in Mexico, 229

Ba = soul, 161
Bāb, The, 250
Babylon, 87–90
Babylonian laws, 89, 265–7
— religion, 180–7
Bacon, Roger, 16, 23
— Lord, 148
Bagha = "god," 200
Bantu race, 54–5
Basevis in India, 76
Basque race, 36, 51–2
Basilicas, 326, 328, 334
Bechuana race, 44, 162
Beech, The, 47
Belgæ, The, 36
Belkapkapu, 90
Bel-nadin-ablu, 93
Belon, Pierre, 18
Bells, 335
Berber race, 53–4
Bes, the god, 165
Bestiaries, 18
Bible, The, 264–87, 341, 347–9
Birth customs, 76–77
Bishops, 320–1, 328, 347–8
Black obelisk, The, 99
— races, 160
Boccacio, 143, 146
Bohemian Reformation, The, 142
Böhtlingk, 24, 61
Bones, 156, 227
Books, Jewish, 287–92
Bopp, on language, 24
Bow, 83, 252
Brahma, the god, 209, 221
Brahmanas, 210
Brain, The, 26–7
Brazil, caves, 37
Brennus, the Gaul, 122
Bretigny, peace of, 141
Bridge to heaven, 188, 203, 205, 226, 322
Bridget, Saint, 142
Britain, 111, 123, 335
Broca, 29, 53
Bronze, 31, 83
Brythons, 43
Buddha, The, 214, 216–7, 229, 316
Buddhism, 214, 217–20, 229
Buddhist writings, 102
Bundahish, The, 208
Burial customs, 77
Burnaburias, 91
Burning bodies, 79
Bushmen, The, 38, 55
Butterfly soul, The, 153
Byzantine Emperors, 126

Cacus, myth of, 189
Calanus, ascetic, 219
Caledonians, 36
Calendars (see Zodiac), 11, 246
Caligula, Emperor, 111
Cambuscan, 139
Cambyses, 98
Camel, name of the, 45
Canaanites, 30, 32, 251–5, 260
Canstadt, skull at, 32, 34
Capacity of skulls, 29, 37
Cappadocia, 65, 86, 89, 103, 207
Carians, 104
Carthage, 95, 109
Caste, 134
Castrén, 24, 61
Catacombs, 263, 310
Cathay, 61
Catholic Church, The, 308–9, 325–7
Cave, simile of, 25
Cavemen, 32–6
Cedar, 83
Celibacy, 336, 344
Cells, microscopic, 19
Celsus, 302, 318–9
Ceylon, 132
Chaldea, 83, 84–5, 93
Champollion, 23, 54
Chandra-Gupta, 99
Chariots, 90, 91
Charlemagne, 126, 131
Charles V., Emperor, 140, 145
Charles Martell, 129
Charms, 181, 290, 314

Charon, the god, 179, 189
Chaucer, 139, 300
Chemistry, 15
Chemosh, the god, 256
China, 101, 138–9, 144, 222–3
Chinese language, 44, 102
— religion, 221
— writing, 101–2
Chivalry, 134
Chosroes of Persia, 125
Chrēstos = "good," 304, 310
Christmas, 335
Chrysostom, 12, 329
Church=Kerk, 332
Cimbri, 110, 122
Cimmerians, 97
Circumcision, 75, 269
Classics, The, 343, 354
Clement of Alexandria, 309
Clovis, 124
Coins, 105, 108, 115, 125, 261
Coloni evicted, 112
Colour of skin, 50
Columbus, 143
Commagene, region, 109, 206
Commentaries, 158
Communion, The, 303–7, 323–4, 325, 334
Comparative Philology, 24, 39
Compass, The, 14
Concubines, 344
Confucius, 101, 138, 220, 222
Consciousness, 27, 28
Constance, Council of, 142
Constantine, 118, 326–7
Constantinople, 111, 137, 140, 149, 338
Contrasts, 147, 149
Copper, 31, 83
Councils, 308, 327, 334, 336, 346
Couvade, custom, 52, 63, 76, 227
Creation, 183, 189, 227, 267
Creeds, 309, 346
Cremation, 79
Crete, 23, 69, 86, 104–5
Criticism, of Bible, 278–83, 301, 318–9
Crœsus, 97
Cromagnon, skull at, 35, 53
Crosier, 336
Cross, 230, 318, 335
Crucifixion, 114, 290
Crusades, 135, 137, 140, 338
Culture, Hebrew, 269
Cuneiform script, 265, 268
Curses, 174–5, 187
Cuvier, 18
Cyprian, 321–3
Cypriote script, 23
Cyprus, 104–5
Cyrus, 98, 197–8

Dagon, the god, 181
Danai, The, 103
Daniel, 277
Darab, legend of, 77
Dardani, The, 93, 103
Darius I., 98, 198
Darwin, 5, 18, 19, 29, 50
Death, 77–80, 150
Death horse, The, 189
Delitzsch, 24
Democritus, 5, 15
Demiurge, The, 314
Demons, 172–5, 292, 309, 320
Dervishes, 248
Deuteronomy, 270
Deva = "god," 200
Dhu en Nūn, 16
Dibon, city, 256
Didache, The, 305–7, 313
Diophantos, 9
Dioscorides, 18
Dogs, 77, 200, 207, 226–7
Dolmens, 33, 34, 78
Dome of the Rock, 129–30
Donner, on Finnish, 24
Doom's Day, 237, 308
Dorians, The, 103
Double axe, The, 55, 59
Dravidians, The, 61, 99, 209
Dreams, 153, 182–3
Druzes, The, 248
Du Bois, 31
Durga, goddess, 209
Dutch, The, 143–5
Dwarfs, 49

Ea, the god, 180
Ea-bani, man-bull, 184
Early words, 40–2
Earth bull, The, 207
East India Company, 144, 148
Easter, 308, 322, 334
Ebionite sect, 299, 312–3
Ecclesia = "congregation," 321
Ecclesiastes, Book of, 284
Ecclesiasticus, Book of, 288
Eclipses, 10, 274
Ecstacy, 160
Eddas, The, 190
Eden, 47, 267
Education, 136, 355
Egypt, 140

Egyptian conquests, 128
— ethics, 85
— language, 40, 57
— religion, 161–70
Egyptians, The, 55
Eichhorn, 281
Elam, country, 85, 91, 96
Elements, supposed, 15
Elephants, 29, 47, 99, 229, 233
Eleusis, mysteries of, 191
Elizabeth, Queen, 147–8
Elishah, land of, 66
Elk, The, 21
Embalming, 79
Emblems, 86, 335
Embryology, 18
Empedocles, 15
Engis, skull at, 32, 34
English progress, 140
Enoch, Book of, 288–9
Epikouros, 1, 116
Epicureans, 116, 290
Equinox, The, 10
Erasmus, 147, 345–6, 348
Eratosthenes, 11
Esarhaddon, 95
Esdras, Vision of, 289
Eshmunazar, 186
Esquimaux, 37, 49, 51, 62
Essenes, The, 219, 311
Esther, Book of, 277
Etana, Legend of, 185
Ethics, 169, 186, 196, 215, 222, 244, 355
Etruscans, The, 4, 57–9, 189
Eucharist, The, 305, 307, 316, 323–4, 334
Euclid, 9
Euripides, 15
Evil, 152–3, 285
Evolution, 18–9, 352, 353
Exorcism, 172, 181
Ezra, Book of, 272

Fables, 185, 292
Fatemite Khalifs, 129
Fathers, The Christian, 308–9, 313
Ferrier, on the brain, 26
Fetish, 155
Feudal system, The, 134
Fig, The, 46, 47
Finns, The, 36, 52, 60
Fire, sacred, 190, 231
First civilisation, 47–8
Fleets, 65–6, 84, 95, 110, 137, 140
Flint tools, 30, 82
Flood, 183–4, 190, 230, 232, 267
Folk-lore, 155, 190
Folletti, spirits, 4, 60, 189
Food, 49
France, History of, 146–7
Francis of Assisi, 339
Franks, The, 124, 126, 133, 135
Frederic I., Emperor, 136
Frederic II., Emperor, 135, 136
Free will, 196, 244, 345–6
Friedenthal, 19

Gailenreuth caves, 32
Galerius, Decree of, 326
Galileo, 16
Gamaliel, 295
Gathas = "hymns," 201–3
Gautama, The Buddha, 214, 216–7
Gayo-mard = "bull-man," 221
Gebal, 186
Gender of nouns, 45
Genii = Fravashis, 206
Genista, cave, 36
Genoese, The, 135 137, 138
Genseric, 123
Geography, 13–5, 267, 274
Geology, 18–22
Germany, 137, 141, 146
Ghosts, 5, 78, 171
Gibeon, 4, 255, 273
Gigim, demons, 173
Gilgamas, 178, 183–4
Gilukhepa, Queen, 92
Gitas = "hymns," 212–3
Gnostics, 313–8
Gods, The, 151, 152, 168, 178, 180, 209
Goethe, 7, 17
Goidels, 43, 69
Gospels, 298–303, 315
Goths, 122–7
Granth of Sikhs, 249
Greek gods, 187
— language, 299
— sages, 191–7
Greeks, The, 71, 102–9, 114
Grenelle, skulls at, 35
Grotius, 279
Guancho race, 53
Gudea, prince, 83–4
Guernsey, dolmens, 34–5
Gunpowder, 141
Gyges, 97

Hades, 157, 164–6, 189, 286
Hadrian, 263, 318
Haeckel, 5, 6, 19
Hair, 50

Hakamanish, 98, 197
Hanîf = "convert," 127, 235
Hans in China, The, 101, 119
Haoma drink, 204, 207, 325
Harp, 83
Harsha, Emperor, 129
Head, Shape of the, 50
Hebrews, The, 65, 93, 251–92, 298
Hegel, 6
Hejirah, Era, 238
Hell (see Hades), 240
Hellenes, The, 68–9
Henotheism, 177
Henry VIII., 347, 349
Heraclitus, 15
Herakles = Hercules, 189
Hermits, 311
Herod, 262
Herodotus, 14, 30, 48, 50, 51, 58, 67–70, 76, 78–9, 84, 162
Hezekiah, 258–9
Hildebrand, Pope, 126, 134, 322, 337
Hillel, 294–5
Hindu gods, 209
Hipparchus, 11
History, 7, 8, 81
Hittite religion, 178–9
— syllabary, 86
Hittites, The, 23, 57, 91–4, 103–4
Hiuen-Tsiang, 219
Hobal, the god, 127, 237
Holger Danske, 188
Holy water, 175, 332
Horse, The, 52, 57, 90
Horus, the god, 165
Hospitals, 100, 230
Hottentots, The, 55
Hovas, The, 56
Human sacrifice, 163, 177, 191, 224, 230, 232
Hungarians, The, 60, 121
Huns, The, 60, 119–20
Hûris = "bright ones," 239
Hus, Johann, 142, 341–3
Huxley, 19
Hyde, 23
Hypatia, 312
Hypnotism, 159, 160, 214, 311, 330
Hyrcanus, 261

Iberians, The, 52, 53, 86
Ibn Batuta, 131
Iconium, 139
Iconoclasts, The, 333
Icons, 333
Idols, 157, 332
Images, 333
Immortality, 5, 156
Incas of Peru, The, 146, 231
Incense, 269, 335
India, 99, 100, 115
Indian religion, 209–20
Indra, 210–11
Indulgences, 338, 344
Infanticide, 77
Innocent III., Pope, 142
Ionians, The, 104
Irenæus, 308, 316
Irish race, The, 69, 70
Iron, metal, 32, 83
Iron = Iranians, 79, 204
Islam, 233–50
Islands, 15, 144
Ismi-Dagon, 90
Israel, 255, 257
Istar, the goddess, 177, 180, 184
Italy, 109, 124, 137, 142, 145
Ivory (see Elephant), 258

Japan, 14, 102, 139, 143, 227
Japanese race, 51, 62
— religion, 223
Jacques de Vitry, 18
Jasher, Book of, 273
Java, skull in, 31
Jehovah (see Yahu), 314
Jehu, 94, 257
Jerome, 329–31
Jerusalem, 253–4, 298, 351
Jesuits, The, 147, 350–2
Jews = Judeans, 66–7, 239, 244
Jimmu Tennu, 102, 223
Job, Book of, 287
John of Damascus, 333
John, Gospel of, 301
Joshua, Book of, 273
Judah, 258
Judah Halevi, 292
Justin Martyr, 304, 308, 325
Justinian, Emperor, 125–6

Ka, = genius, 161
Ka'aba, The, 127, 237
Kabiri, gods, 189
Kadasman Burias, 94
Kaldi = Chaldeans, 82
Kanishka, Emperor, 218
Kant, philosopher, 6, 193, 353
Kassites, The, 10, 90, 92, 94
Kaswini, botanist, 18
Katapan = "plenipotentiary," 129

Kedeshoth, 185
Kelts, The, 52, 59, 69, 70, 86
Kent's cavern, 32
Khadijah, 234, 236, 238
Khitai, tribe, 60, 121, 138
Khonds, tribe, 209, 231
Khozars, tribe, 120–1
Khufu = Cheops, 85
Kiblah, The, 246
Kings, Book of, 275
Kismah = "lot," 244
Kiss of Peace, The, 304, 312
Knox, John, 349
Korān, The, 23, 136, 241–3
Koranna tribe, 55
Krishna, the god, 213, 247
Kublai Khan, 139, 143
Kufic alphabet, 130, 131
Kushan, dynasty, 108

Lake dwellings, 32, 33, 68
Lamarck, 18
Lancastrian Kings, 141
Language, 38–49
Lao-tze, 222
Lapp race, 36, 37, 49, 51, 60
Lapis lazuli, 83, 105,
Lars = "chief," 189
Latin, 116, 135
Laws, 89, 125, 245 265–6
Legends, 178, 183, 242, 291, 335
Lemnos language, 69
Lens, The, 13
Leo X., Pope, 22, 342
Levirate marriage, 61, 74, 269
Libyans, The, 54, 82, 93
Light, 12–3, 193
Lilith = "ghost," 292
Lion, The, 46, 277
Liturgies, 335
Logoi, Christian, 313
Logos, The, 193, 297, 301
Lollards, The, 340, 342
Lombards, The, 126, 133
Long barrows, 36, 69
Louis XI., King, 141
Louis XIII., King, 146
Louis XIV. and XVI., 147
Loyola, 350–1
Lucretius, 1, 116
Luther, 344–6
Lycians, The, 68, 76, 103
Lycurgus, 105
Lydians, The, 58, 59, 97, 104–5 207
Lyell, 18

Ma, the goddess, 179
Macedonians, The, 107, 126
Māgan, country, 83
Magi, The, 198–9, 207
Magic, 151, 163–4, 174–6, 181
Magellan, 12
Mahmūd of Ghuzni, 132
Maimonides, 290, 292
Malays, The, 37, 56, 61, 232
Mamūn, El, 131
Mammoth, The, 21, 32, 33
Manasseh, King, 259
Manchus, The, 144, 221
Manes, The heretic, 316
Manuscripts, Bible, 271–2, 302–3
Maori race, 61
Marcionites, The, 303, 328
Marco Polo, 14, 132, 138–9
Marcus, the Gnostic, 315
Marcus Aurelius, 355
Marduk, the god, 157, 180
Marduk-nadin-akhi, 93
Marius, 110
Mark, Gospel of, 300–1
Marriage customs, 73, 75
Martu = "the west," 85
Mary Stuart, 147
Mashonaland, ruins, 66
Masons, The, 351
Mass, The, 335
Mas'ûdi, 131
Materialism, 7
Mathematics, 9, 10
Matriarchate, The, 76
Matthew, Gospel of, 299
Matthew's Bible, 347–9
Maurya, dynasty, 99
Maundeville, Sir John, 140
Mayer, 16
Mecca, 127–8, 237, 239
Medes, The, 96, 97, 200
Melek Shah, 132
Melukha, country, 83
Mencius, 101, 223
Mengku Khan, 138, 139
Mesha, of Moab, 255–7
Messiahs, 188, 206, 208, 278, 284
Metals, transmutation of, 16
Meton, cycle of, 10
Mexico, 228–31
Microscope, The, 13, 19
Mind, The, 26–9
Ming, dynasty, 139
Mineptah, 93, 255
Minyan race, 92, 103
Miracles, 273–4
Mishnah, The, 290–1

Mithra, the god, 199, 200, 206–7, 324, 328, 335
Mithradates, 110, 122, 207
Mitre, origin of, 336
Moabite language, 65
— stone, 255
Mongols, The, 50, 56, 63, 138, 144
Monicelli, gnomes, 4
Monism, 7
Monks, 230, 244, 312, 327, 338–9, 340
Monotheism, 168, 241, 265, 285
Monsoon, The, 132
Montaigne, 146
Montanists, sect, 309, 312
Moses, 265
Moslems, The, 127–33, 235, 243
Muhammad, 127, 130, 233–42
Muhammad II., Sultan, 141
Mummies, 163, 166
Mycenæ, 103
Mylodon, sloth, 21
Mysticism, 158–9, 249
Mysteries, 191
Myths, 151, 167, 178, 224, 226, 241–2

Nabu-cudur-usur, 93
Nanak, in India, 249
Naram-addu, 94
Natural History, 17–20
Neanderthal, skull at, 34
Nebo, the god, 176, 180
— the town, 256
Nebuchadnezzar, 98
Negro race, 50, 55
Negrillos, 51
Negritos, 37, 50, 51, 61
Neolithic remains, 30, 33
Nephthys, the goddess, 165
Nergal, the god, 180, 181
Nestorians, The, 132, 136, 139
Nestorius, 335
Newton, 12
New Zealand, 62
Nimrud Dagh, 109
Nineveh, 89, 95
Nirvana, 219
Normans, The, 34, 71, 133, 136
Norsemen, The, 71, 133
Nubians, The, 54
Numerals, 9
Numidians, The, 66
Nuns in America, 229, 230
Nut, the goddess, 165
Nuter = "power," 164

Odoacer, 123
Olive, The, 46, 47
Omens, 182, 190
Ommeya Khalifs, 129
Omri, of Israel, 256
Ong-Khan = Prester John, 138–9
Ophites, sect of, 314, 319
Orgies, 160, 331
Origen, 309, 314, 319
Oscans, 70
Osiris, the god, 164–5
Ossetes, tribe, 69
Ox-waggons, 70

Paca = "chief," 252, 254
Palæolithic remains, 30
Palestine, 135, 141
Palmyra, 117, 131
Panjâb, The, 99, 107
Panis, demons, 189, 200
Pantheism, 7, 161
Papias, on Gospels, 300
Paracelsus, 16
Paradise, 221, 239–40, 276
Parthians, The, 100, 108, 207
Patagonians, The, 37, 49
Patna, in India, 99, 120
Paul of Tarsus, 295–8
Pelasgi, race of, 68, 69
Pentateuch, The, 265–70, 282
Pepin, King, 126
Perseus, Legend of, 77
Persia, 140
Persians, 98, 106
Persian gods, 200
— religion, 197–209
Peru, 231
Pharisees, The, 289, 295
Philip Augustus, King, 141
Philology, 24, 38–49
Philosophers, 191–7, 293
Phœnicians, The, 95
Phrygians, The, 68, 103
Picture writing, 56, 228
Piers Ploughman, 140, 340–1
Pigtails, 57
Pineal gland, the, 28
Pisans, The, 137
Pistis Sophia, book, 314
Pitakas, Buddhist, 217–8
Plantagenets, The, 140
Plato, 193–5
Pliny, 12, 18, 20, 304
Plutarch, 110, 114, 116, 168, 190
Podesta, The, 137
Poemandres, book, 313
Pollution by dead, 269

Polgamy, 244, 246
Polynesians, 62
Pompey, 108–9
Pontifex Maximus, The, 322
Popes, The, 126, 135, 138, 322, 341–3, 351
Portugal, 143, 144
Postal systems, 138, 146
Prasias, lake, 32, 68
Prester John, 139
Priest-kings, 110–1
Printing, 141
Prognathic jaws, 35, 50
Protestants, The, 140, 341, 345–50
Proverbs, Book of, 276
Providence, 293, 356, 357
Provincials, The, 117
Psalms, The, 268, 275–6, 329, 342
Ptah-hotep, Maxims of, 169
Ptolemy, the geographer, 14
Ptolemies, The, 107
Punt, land of, 50, 85
Purgatory, 334, 345
Pygmies, The, 50
Pythagoras, 192

Quietests, The, 160

Ra, the god, 165–6
Rabelais, 146
Races of mankind, 48–73
Rameses II. and III., 93, 94
Rameses, city, 268
Raphael, the painter, 22
Rawlinson, Sir H., 23, 24
Red Indians, The, 37, 63–4
Reformation, The, 141, 341–350
Rhinoceros, The, 99
Reindeer, The, 21, 32, 33
Relics, 335–6
Renaissance, The, 141–2, 147, 342–3
Republic of Plato the, 194
Resheph, the god, 181
Resurrection, The, 157, 202, 284, 286, 296–7
Reuchlin, 345
Revivalism, 160, 312, 330
Richard I., King, 141
Ricimer, 123
Rig-Veda, 199, 210
Rimmon, the god, 185
Rimmon Nirari, 96
Robert Guiscard, 134
Rogers, John, 347
Rollo, 133
Roman Church, The, 322, 331–8, 343, 346
— Empire, 111–5
— superstitions, 189–90
Romans, The, 111–14
Romulus, Legend of, 77
Roods, 340, 349–50
Roots of speech, 39–40
Rubruquis the Franciscan, 138
Rude stone monuments, 72
Rudolph of Hapsburg, 141
Runes, origin of, 122
Russia, 147

Sabbath, The, 185, 269
Sabean Arabs, The, 54, 66, 99
Sabiūn = "baptists," 243, 313
Sacerdos, 321
Sacred beasts, 162, 226
Sadducees, The, 289
Sakas, The, 108
Saladin, 130, 141, 237
Salmon in the Volga, 47
Samaritan Pentateuch, 272
Samarkand, 139
Samson, 274
Sanhedrin, The, 263
Saracenic architecture, 131
Sargina = "founder king," 77, 82, 178
Sargon, 95, 96
Sassanians, The, 125, 208
Satan, 240, 242
Sati = suttee, 68, 228, 232
Savonarola, 342
Saxons, The, 123, 131
Scandinavians, The, 34, 35, 71
Scape-goat, The, 269
Sceptics, 193, 247–8
Schisms, 327, 337
Schlieden, 19
Schliemann, 103
Science, 5, 8–25, 353, 354
Scotland, 147–8
Scots, The, 49, 349, 350
Scythians, The, 67, 97
Seal, habitat of, 47
Seals, Hebrew, 260
Seb, the god, 165
Seclusion of women, 245
Seir, mount, 253
Seleucus, 107
Selim, Sultan, 140
Seljuks, The, 132, 140
Semitic home, The, 46, 65
— languages, 39–40, 46, 65
— myths, 92

Semitic races, 64
— words in Greece, 189
Senefru, in Egypt, 84
Sennacherib, 95, 258
Septuagint, The, 271
Serapis, 263
Set or Sut, the god, 90, 165, 179
Seti I. in Egypt, 93
Shalmaneser I., 99
Shalmaneser II., 94
Shamash Rimmon, 96
Shell mounds, 33
Sheol = Hades, 157, 176, 184, 286
Shiâh, sect, 249
Shin-to, religion, 223–4
Shishak, 94, 255
Sicily, 95, 105
Sidon, city, 95
Sigismund, Emperor, 142
Sign language, 38
Sikhs, The, 249
Silk, 121, 124, 132
Siloam text, 258
Simon Magus, 315
Sin, 152, 177, 182
Sinai, mines in, 84
Sinim, land of, 85
Siva, the god, 209
Slaves, 113, 244
Slav race, The, 71
Smith, George, 23
Solomon, 94
Solon, 105
Soma drink, The, 200, 204, 243, 324
Song of Songs, The, 276, 279–80
Sons of God, 174, 176, 297, 319
Sosiosh, in Persia, 206, 208
Soul, The, 153–5, 162, 164, 212, 227, 309
Sound, changes of, 42–3
Spain, 51, 52, 143, 145
Spells, 182
Spencer, Herbert, 19
Spenser, 139, 148
Sphinx, The, 59
Spinoza, 292
Spirits, 80, 150
Spiritualism, 160
Spiritual marriages 315,
Spy, Skull at, 34
Stature of mankind, 49
Stoics, The, 116, 193
Stomach, human, 49
Stonehenge, 72
Stregha = "witch," 4
Stuarts, The, 148
Subintroduced sisters, 329
Sufi dynasty, 140
Sufis in Islam, 160, 246, 249
Suleimân, Sultan, 140
Sunni, sect, 249
Superstitions, 2, 219, 290–2
Susa, discoveries at, 89, 270
Sutekh, the god, 90, 179
Swastika, emblem, 59, 87, 179, 231
Swedes, The, 49
Synagogues in Palestine, 263
Syntax, 44
Syrian civilisation, 9

Ta = "shade," 162
Tabernacle, The, 269
Tablets, 268, 272–3
Tablier Égyptien, 55
Taboo, 155
Talmud, The, 291
Tammuz, the god, 180, 184-5, 249
Tarkon = "chief," 59
Tarsus, 104
Tchengiz Khan, 138
Tefnut, the goddess, 166
Teie, Queen, 92
Telescope, The, 12
Tell Loh, 83
Templars, The, 140, 351
Ten Commandments, The, 266, 270, 271–2
Tertullian, 305, 309, 325
Te-Umman, King, 96
Teutons, The, 71
Thales, 9, 192
Theandrites, deity, 328
Therapeutai, The, 219, 311
Thermometer, The, 16
Thothmes I., III., and IV., 91, 92
Thracians, The, 68
Tiglath-pileser, I. and III., 93, 94, 257
Timur the Tartar, 139
Tin, 31
Tobit, Book of, 289
Tones, Chinese, 45
Torture, 114
Totems, 155, 162, 226
Trade, 101, 115, 131, 133-5, 137–8, 139, 148, 149, 261
Transubstantiation, 324, 338
Trent, Council of, 308, 346–7
Trinity, Dogma of, 242
Troy, Discoveries at, 32, 35, 103
Travellers, Arab, 131
Turanians. The, 39, 45, 56–64

Turks, The, 45, 51, 57, 126, 133, 139–40, 144
Tyre, city, 84, 95

Uigurs, people, 121
Universities, 136–7
Upanishads, 210
Usertasen I., in Egypt, 85
Utuk, demon, 173

Valhalla, 157
Valkyries, The, 157, 240
Vámbéry, 24, 39, 45
Vandals, The, 54, 120
Varangers, The, 133
Varuna, the god, 187, 211
Vasco da Gama, 143
Vedas, The, 210–12
Vendidad, The, 204–5
Venetians, The, 135, 138
Vikings, The, 133
Vine, The, 45, 47, 307
Virgin mothers, 63, 111, 221, 227, 230, 278, 303, 319, 335
Vishnu, the god, 209, 213, 291
Vistasp = Hystaspes, 203, 206
Voltaire, 12, 20, 23, 279, 344
Vowel harmony, 43
Von Baer, 18

Wahhābis, sect of, 250
War, 356
Weights, Hebrew, 259
Wisdom, Book of, 287–8
World tree, The, 188
Wyclif, 141, 324, 341

Xenophanes, 5, 20

Yahu = Jehovah, 258, 261, 314
Yākūt, traveller, 131
Yama, the god, 211, 232
Yan-yin, theory, 222 224, 232
Yashts, hymns, 206
Yehumelek of Gebal, 186
Yogis in India, 159
Young, 12

Zaggisi, King, 82
Zendavesta, The, 23
Zenobia, 117
Zirgul = Tell Loh, 83
Zoan, city, 268
Zodiac, The, 11, 45, 108, 232
Zoroaster, 200–4, 317
Zu, the god, 185
Zulus, The, 55, 74, 162

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Tent Work in Palestine	1878
Handbook to the Bible	1879
Judas Maccabæus	1879
Heth and Moab	1883
Primer of Bible Geography	1883
Syrian Stone Lore	1887
Altaic Hieroglyphs	1887
Palestine	1891
Tell Amarna Tablets	1893
The Bible and the East	1896
The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem	1897
The Hittites and their Languages	1898
The Hebrew Tragedy	1900
The First Bible	1902
Critics and the Law	1907

Printed by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

CB
67
C6

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara
Goleta, California

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

AVAILABLE FOR
CIRC[illegible]
DI[illegible]
JUL 1 5

NOV 2 3 1960

20m-3,'59 (A552s4) 476

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 776 301 4